The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 1906.

The Week.

The usual comment on the new State formed by the union of Oklahoma and Indian Territory is that it waited too long for what it deserved. In the public mind, this rich territory of 70,000 square miles has been knocking none too insistently at the doors of Congress demanding to be taken into the "sisterhood of States." As a matter of fact, if the Fifty-eighth Congress had provided for the union of the two Territories in a single State, some awkward questions would have remained to vex the State Government. It is true that no Territory ever approached these two in the matter of population before admission, but in no Territory was it ever so small a handicap not to have Statehood. The demand to be released from the disabilities of the old status has been really urgent only since the Fifty-ninth Congress met last December. The outcome is creditable to the progressives of Oklahoma and Indian Territory, but in view of the problems that had to be considered we cannot think that the delay was due altogether to the Speaker's stubborn determination to yoke Arizona and New Mexico into the team.

Amazement has been frequently expressed by critics of the Statehood bill that the wishes of some 800,000 people of Oklahoma and nearly the same number in Indian Territory could be ignored. They forget that the increase of population has been sudden. The census of 1900 gave Oklahoma 398,000 population, and credited 392,000 people to Indian Territory. Since then both these figures have doubled. But, however rapidly the white population increased, there was no available magic by which to turn, at once and to their advantage, 80,000 Indians into so many "Statehood or bust" advocates. Add to this the fact that 31,400 square miles out of the 70,430 belonged exclusively to these 80,000 Indians, and it may be understood that patience and skill were needed to effect the combination. Though the separate-Statehood idea never spread very far in Indian Territory, there was certainly a good case to be made out for the "State of Sequoyah." It required a really admirable broad-mindedness on the part of Indian Territory to put herself, temporarily, and probably permanently, under a State government at Guthrie, to agree to a brief limitation of the ordinance of prohibition, and to shoulder a proportionate share of the responsibilities without any near prospect of getting a fair share of political rewards.

Now that Oklahoma is disposed of, what is to become of Arizona and New Mexico? Is the Foraker amendment merely a polite way of keeping out both Territories, or is it, as some of its former opponents now profess, a practical equivalent of the original Two-State bill? Nobody knows. But much of the advance speculation seems to ignore the very radical difference between what the people of Arizona want and what they will take. Nobody has so much as asserted that they wanted to be amalgamated with New Mexico. For several years past one of the chief industries of the Territory has been the dispatching of telegrams to Congress at supposedly psychological moments. Separate-Statehood resolutions have figured prominently among its exports. But why any one should place the slightest confidence in the fact that at the State Fair in Phœnix last year only three Arizonians out of many thousand voted for joint Statehood, is a mystery of statesmanship. Of course, they voted against joint Statehood because the alternative was separate Statehood, instead of, as in the coming referendum, no Statehood at all. When the solicitous parent asks, "Would you rather have me give you a nickel or a dollar?" there is never any doubt what the child will reply. But when it is a question between taking the nickel now and trusting to the chance of getting the dollar at some time in the future, it is a different matter.

Nothing but complete success could justify the President's extraordinary course in the meat-inspection controversy. We say nothing of his abandonment of the Constitutional theory of the independent spheres of Congress and the Executive; he had already left that a thousand miles behind him. But next he came out in the rôle not merely of a dictator, but of a hectorer. In an angry, scolding, and even insulting tone towards a leading committee of the House of Representatives, and, inferentially, towards the House itself, he offered a rude challenge which was instantly accepted. Chairman Wadsworth gave Mr. Roosevelt as good as he sent; convicted him of ignorance of the very bill he was denouncing; and answered his letter with an acerbity and sharp resentment with which, it is safe to say, no President was ever addressed under similar circumstances. It was not doubtful that the House would stand behind its committee and its Speaker, and read the President a lesson. Thus Mr. Roosevelt, not content with having inflamed the Senate against him, rushed into a quarrel with the House.

Chairman Wadsworth repelled with heat, for himself and his colleagues, the President's charge that they had made themselves the tools of the packers. He implied that Congressmen knew what their constituents wanted. In fact, evidence accumulates that the vast farming interests affected are anxious to have the meat-inspection business settled quickly and with as little friction as possible. Representative Williams discovered this on Friday, when, in an attempt to drum up Democratic support for the President, he found that the Texas delegation would fail him, since Texas cattle-growers are demanding the House substitute for the Beveridge amendment. All through the West, indeed, there is a new-born feeling that Trust-busting is not what it was cracked up to be. This docking the cheering spectator 10 per cent. on the price of his cattle makes the spectacle of heroically attacking the Octopus much less thrilling.

Peace has come so suddenly in the cruel meat-inspection war at Washington that many a Peterkin will be asking what the fight was all about. It should be enough that "it was a famous victory"—this time for all concerned. The President won, Speaker Cannon won, Chairman Wadsworth won, and Senator Beveridge beat them all. The obvious fact is that the bill as now agreed upon represents a compromise. Mr. Roosevelt has yielded on at least three points which, in his message and letters, he had said were essential—the payment of the cost of inspection by the packers, the dating of the labels on canned meats, and the making "the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture" final. On the other hand, the President has succeeded in getting the court-review provision stricken out and putting back the appointment of inspectors under the civil-service rules. The whole adjustment seems fair, and might, one would think, have been reached without all the shouting. It is a capital illustration of Mr. Roosevelt's flexibility as a politician that, after his violent letters to Mr. Wadsworth, he should have sat down in sweet reasonableness and patched up a compromise. All hands seem now disposed to cut the flurry short; and with the passage of the inspection bill, and the fine certificate which the packers will soon get from the committee of veterinarians and pathologists about to investigate their establishments, we shall all be presently acclaiming American meats as the best and purest in the world.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why the Government is making such a fuss over the freight rebates secured by the packers on their export shipments, we do not quite understand. It would have been simple enough two years ago, because then the sale of American products to foreigners at a lower price than stay-at-home citizens paid was a reprehensible practice, which no one fell into except occasionally under necessity. But since the country has learned this winter from the speeches of several of the most eminent Republicans that "dumping" our surplus abroad is the rule, and is the best possible thing for home industries, no matter how low prices the foreigner pays, a Republican Attorney-General has not the faintest excuse for interfering with this phase of business. For, if it is a good thing to sell meat or steel rails cheap abroad, it must be a better thing to sell them cheaper still. The greater the reduction in price to the foreigner, the more praiseworthy are the agencies which bring this condition about. If the rebate cuts off another fraction from the price the Frenchman or German pays for his American goods, ought we not, therefore, to encourage the rebate? At home it is different, because we want our countrymen to pay high prices and thereby escape being made "cheap men."

Even without a new law for systematizing the consular service, it is possible for the President to institute about as near an approach to the merit system as he chooses. The sixty-one transfers sent to the Senate on Friday are, we take it, just about what would have been put into effect had the Lodge bill been passed in its original form. Out of eleven consul-generals in the batch of nominations, two are promoted from posts of the same title, but at less important cities; seven are raised from the grade of consul, one from that of vice-consul, while the eleventh man, Mr. Haywood, though not now in the service, has been a confidential clerk in the Department, and had served with distinction as Consul-General at Honolulu. The list of consuls shows similar advances from the grades of vice-consul and consular agent. The whole, which is said to be the result of several weeks' work by Secretary Root and Mr. Carr, the efficient chief of the Consular Bureau, is in every way a splendid beginning for the permanent improvement of our representation abroad. The trouble is that the maintenance of a high standard in the consular service is dependent solely on the will of the Executive. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Root have high ideals for this important branch of the Government's work. It is the duty of Congress to place the reform on such a basis that no future officials who may be less particular about this matter can undo the good that has been accomplished.

It is a fine game of cross purposes which the House and Senate are playing in the matter of the Panama Canal. No sooner does the Senate decide to pass a sea-level bill on June 21, than the House proceeds to whip through a lock-canal amendment on the Friday previous. This may seem amusing, but it is really tragic. To see a vast Government undertaking so mishandled and left in such a tangle is depressing. What course will the President elect? With the two houses of Congress deadlocked, he cannot act under the authority of either. He himself has expressed doubts of the present adequacy of the original Spooner act. It is said by some that final decision in regard to the "type" of canal may be left over till next session, and that meanwhile work can be done in the Culebra cut and elsewhere of a sort that would be necessary under any plan. Unfortunately for this contention, Chief Engineer Stevens has pronounced against it. He has declared that no more work of any consequence can be done to advantage till the engineering features are fixed. Of course, the $26,000,000 can be appropriated and spent on supplies and sanitation, if it is absolutely necessary to get rid of the money, but that will scarcely advance the real canal. It is a vexing posture of affairs for a President who had to exceed his powers and outrage a weak nation three years ago, because he could not wait another day for that canal.

In voting to purchase Panama Canal supplies in the home market, unless the President regards the prices as "extortionate or unreasonable," the House of Representatives has been lamentably inconsistent. Why, in the name of William McKinley, Nelson Dingley, and all the saints of the calendar of protection, should the Government balk at extortionate and unreasonable prices? The existing tariff laws are framed for the express purpose of allowing manufacturers to wring the last penny from the hapless consumer. The private citizen must pay outrageous bills, like them or not; the Government which has framed the tariff schedules ought equally to abide by them. The burden of decision, we note, is thrown on an omniscient President. He and he alone can tell whenever a price has exceeded the bounds of propriety. In the process of determining the exact line between reason and unreason, he must be guided by benevolent intuition. Obviously, he must leave wholly out of the reckoning the quotations of the foreign market, glutted with the products of pauper labor. The price in the home market may be equally delusive, for it may, in the words of Congress itself, be extortionate and unreasonable. Congress has refused to approve as a standard the "export prices" which our Trusts are asking of the foreigner. Nothing, then, is left for the President but the "inner light."

If Secretary Root's reply to the Panama Liberals who want the United States to guarantee fair play in the coming election is read without taking a breath, it sounds impressive. It is as sonorous and as evanescent, in real meaning, as one of Abraham Brick's eulogies. We understand well enough that Gov. Magoon is to be our "watcher" down there —"will be instructed to look over the situation"; but what, in the name of international diplomacy, are the "usages which obtain between nations" when one hears that election frauds are being perpetrated in the other's territory? Beyond going to the officials of the Panama Government and warning them that he is watching the polls, Gov. Magoon can do nothing; Mr. Root's note will have no terrors for the Panamans. It can be matched in bombastic unintelligibility by the least important among Latin-American officials. However, Dr. Arosemena and his fellow-Liberals will have the advantage of being able to say that President Roosevelt has expressed a deep interest in the election. This could not be construed as "intervention"; and if the moral sense of the electors of Panama is as keen as it should be, the knowledge that "Roosevelt wants a square deal down there" should be more effective even than Mr. Root's note and Gov. Magoon's good-natured and entirely unofficial supervision.

"Unless [our] petitions are answered in a better tone in the future," said Sampel Gompers on June 11 before the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, "we shall change the request into a demand." We suppose the right to "demand" is a natural offshoot of the right to petition. Certainly, political parties out of power are very fond of "demanding" reforms they want, and organized labor should enjoy the same privilege. But just what is the "tone" which Mr. Gompers insists must be made "better"? About a week before, the House Committee on the Judiciary decided, by a divided vote, not to report any of the anti-injunction bills. This is a committee made up of eighteen of the ablest lawyers in Congress. All but four of them have served on the same committee in previous years, and listened not once, but more than once, to the multitudinous arguments for and against these measures. The whole ground was gone over again this year. If a majority of the committee is not yet convinced of the wisdom of the proposed legislation, there may possibly be some other

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reason than over-friendliness to the capitalistic class.

"Perkins, 798; Cummins, 725," is less disquieting to the Iowa progressives than "Perkins, 822; Cummins, 820," would be. While the reform Governor is far behind his rival in the number of delegates pledged, his supporters point out that, in order to divide the vote, Perkins must get 23 more supporters. Whether it will be "23 for Perkins," in the slang sense, cannot, of course, be predicted. But it should be remembered that hardly more than a week ago Cummins was farther ahead than Perkins is now. If Shaw turned Scott County's 35 delegates to the standpatter, it is not inconceivable that the Governor himself might work industriously in the eight counties that have still to hold conventions, and triumph finally. It would be a pity to lose Cummins from Iowa politics just now. The real fight should come later, when a successor to Senator Allison is chosen, and when Secretary Shaw himself might become the Governor's rival. To meet the great apostle of high prices and standpattism in hand-to-hand fighting would be to acquire merit; to fight him through Perkins, and lose, would be to submit the "Iowa idea" to undeserved indignity.

The scheme for a national school of fine arts is still pretty much in the air. Apparently, a new organization is planned. Neither the present Art Students' League, with its remarkable record, nor the Academy Schools, with their Columbia affiliation, are felt to carry the desired authority. To create an American École des Beaux-Arts would be an interesting experiment, but the utility of one new mill for the wholesale production of artists is by no means evident. The aspirant who cannot find some sort of teaching to his taste in New York, Boston, or Philadelphia, is surely hard to please. In fact, an observer of our painting and sculpture might be inclined to believe that the facilities for instruction in these subjects were not too scanty, but quite the contrary. It is easy to see how, by the founding of a national school, a very welcome dignity and emolument might be conferred upon a score of our more prominent artists. That in a brief time such a school should enjoy the authority of that of Paris is, of course, out of the question. It is not even certain that such a result is desirable. American art, like that of England, has always been rebellious against authority; it has thriven best along extra-academical lines. If this be our national genius, we had better accept it with all its limitations, than ape the bureaucratic fashions of France. But if somebody must found something, a national school of fine arts affords a fairly entertaining and presumably harmless field for experimentation.

Mr. Chamberlain's cabled prediction that the Liberal Government would not last a year, turns out to have been simply a way of cheering on his constituents at Birmingham. He was exhorting them to be "ready," to make up their minds to give him 1,000 greater majority next time, and he then, in a fine oratorical glow, declared that no man could tell when the summons to battle might come —why, possibly next spring! It is hard even for the London *Times* to take this as a sober prophecy, though it remarks on Mr. Chamberlain's skill "in electioneering questions." He seems, however, to have got into so confirmed a habit of predicting the fall of Mr. Balfour's Government that he has begun it already on Bannerman. It is a little too preposterous. The Ministry is no doubt having trouble with the Education bill, but no quarrel with the Lords or the Church of England on that subject can seriously embarrass it. At most, a recasting of the Cabinet would follow. The trouble with Chamberlain is that he had so freely denied in advance the capacity of the Liberals to form a Government which would hold together a twelvemonth, that he now appears as a prophet to support himself in the rôle of a reviler.

In view of the disposition to regard the revolution in Russia as a fact almost accomplished, Mr. Lionel James's account of an interview with Gekker, the revolutionary leader, in *Macmillan*, is interesting if only for its novelty. Gekker said that "the general strike and the revolution at Moscow have both, in a sense, been failures." Mr. James infers that the objective of the revolutionists is indefinite. Their ideal is that of anarchism rather than of republicanism. The greatest obstacle in the way of the revolutionary movement is the expense of carrying it on. This is felt especially by the Union of Unions, whose "funds are low." In South Russia, for example, this organization levies an inhabited-house tax of a third of one month's rent per householder. The Jewish Bund levies a tax based on a tenement return, and the Social and Constitutional Democracy a poll-tax of about 50 cents a head. Terrorists and anarchists often resort to blackmail for tribute. This naturally tends to make the movement unpopular. But revolutions usually pay their own way, sometimes by the self-sacrifice of their supporters, often by pillage and devastation. Nor is a definite and positive ideal altogether essential to revolutionary success, as was proved by the changing purposes and policies before and during the Reign of Terror.

Mr. Bryan's remark at St. Petersburg upon the patience of the Duma in waiting for the full assertion and recognition of its rights, but echoes the comments of the most skilled French and English newspaper correspondents on the spot. They have several times thought a violent break with the Czar imminent, yet thus far it has been averted. One restraining influence on either side is little spoken of, yet it must have much quiet influence. We mean the critical state of Russian finance, with the great commitments of Germany as well as France in Russian loans. As a consequence, there must be a steady diplomatic pressure upon the Czar not to take any rash step which would mean a default on Russian bonds held abroad. Business relations must also be availed of privately to impress the same warning upon Russians of position in the commercial and financial world. None but the maddest revolutionist, in fact, could wish to see the old régime go down in crash and conflagration, with the sure result of repudiation of Russia's debts and the dislike and distrust of her most powerful neighbors. The financial argument makes strongly for concessions by both Czar and Duma (on Friday, Russian fours sank to 72). It plainly will not bear everything, however. The division of the Duma into social classes shows that there are 200 peasants to 17 merchants and 34 landlords. That suggests the limits of the appeal on the score of public finance.

The deadlock which thus far the Czar and the Duma have contrived to avoid, seems to be approaching. By prorogation, the court can at any time force the situation, but it is unlike Nicholas II. to precipitate a conflict that may be approached by gradual stages. In fact, the break is rather more likely to come from the side of the Duma. Till now it has occupied itself in memorials which could be evaded, and in platonic condemnation of the Ministry, which could be ignored. The moment it passes any broad, constructive law, the issue of obedience between Parliament and Crown will confront the public officials. That moment can hardly be long deferred; and, since the Czar shows no signs of attenuating popular demands by anticipating their formal presentation, the present suspense undoubtedly makes for revolution. Delay is surely no way out of the present *impasse*, when each levy injects seditious material into the army, when the agrarian disorders are reappearing, and a general strike is being seriously planned. But no monarch, we believe, has ever yet taken the fable of the Sibylline leaves seriously, until his name in turn has become an accepted illustration of the classical theme.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EXECUTIVE AS LEGISLATOR.

It is always instructive to trace the development of extra-Constitutional practices. In the making they are often more interesting than when fully formed. The great extension which Mr. Roosevelt is giving to the functions of the President as an author of legislation calls attention afresh to the process by which the Executive, whom the Constitution plainly expected to keep his hands off law-making (except for recommending measures), has become the most potent of all in acute legislative crises.

It is, admittedly, of ancient date. Washington not only asked but worked for legislation he thought necessary. When the Senate amended one of his treaties he lost his temper and expressed his displeasure to the Senate in person. Lincoln pushed this prerogative of the President, with many others, to an extreme in the days of the civil war, when so many laws and precedents had to be silent. Grant was influential with Congress, through expressed wish and threatened veto. Cleveland made his daring utterance against the Gorman silver compromise, and smashed it; he wrote his famous "perfidy" letter in the effort to prevent the Wilson tariff bill from being protectionized in the Senate, but failed. McKinley was far less open in his methods, preferring to be confidential and cajoling; but it is probable that no President ever came nearer getting what he wanted from the lawmakers. The names cited show how impossible it now is to raise the Constitutional point against the habit, with any force. The general rule seems to be that when the President interferes to compass legislation which you ardently desire, you are entitled to proclaim his action a patriotic exercise of the powers of his great office; but when he bestirs himself to secure the enactment of laws which you regard as vicious, you have the privilege of denouncing his course as utterly repugnant to the Constitution.

President Roosevelt's innovations in this particular are mainly those of technique. He has surpassed all his predecessors in the openness and directness of his procedure. With an inborn contempt for conventions, he goes straight to his goal. Of what avail would be the White House telephone, unless Mr. Roosevelt could speak over it to the Senate as plumply as if he were on the floor? For him to hesitate to make that use of it would be to refuse to take advantage of the resources of civilization. And during the past two weeks in connection with the meat-inspection controversy, we have seen the President taking charge of legislation with a simple good faith as marked as his somewhat over-confident zeal. To the Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture he wrote in the imperative tone of a Prime Minister giving orders to a subordinate. He summoned the Speaker. With a member of the House Committee he went over the pending bill, line by line, precisely as if he were himself chairman, licking a law into shape before reporting it. This country has never seen anything quite like that. The President never before so completely assumed the rôle of a legislator.

Mr. Roosevelt is carrying off the part with customary dash. He is, however, uncovering certain awkwardnesses in the double relation. Obviously, when the President of the United States turns his hand to legislation, he has a great advantage over ordinary Representatives or Senators. They may speak in the name of their constituencies or States; he comes forward as the chosen of the whole people. (Of course, it is only something more than half the people at the time of election, but immediately thereafter, by a pleasant fiction, the President becomes the interpreter of the sentiments of every man, woman, and child.) This necessarily carries great weight; but it also lays upon the President the duty of making no mistakes. The infallible spokesman of the infallible people must fall into no blunders. Hence the misfortune of the gross error which President Roosevelt made in his first letter to Mr. Wadsworth, and which he handsomely acknowledges in his second. After saying that "I have gone over your bill very carefully," he had to admit that he did not know what was in it. Now, this would be a sore discomfiture to a debater on the floor of the House; and when the President comes forward as practically such a debater, he cannot escape appearing discomfited also. This is certainly a disadvantage of Mr. Roosevelt's open and slashing style. If he had simply conferred and advised, without rushing too hastily into cold type, he would not have had to make his apology. And an infallible people does not like to see its infallible President forced to apologize.

But Roosevelt the debater rides off on the excuse of a sovereign that the blunder was not his, but that of his advisers. It was Beveridge that misled him. It was Reynolds whose sociological eye failed to find in the bill what the President now confesses was there all the time. Yes, but the President did not say that it was Beveridge and Reynolds who had carefully gone over the Wadsworth bill and found it "very, very bad." He inadvertently used the "I," and that makes it difficult afterwards to say "they." The people in Parliament, under a Constitutional monarchy, are entitled to demand the resignation of the "they"—the Ministers at fault—but we have no way of getting at Beveridge or Reynolds. They may continue to poison the mind of the President. This shows the vice of his frank assumption of the rôle of legislator. Therein he wears the guise of a Prime Minister, responsible to a Parliament; but he does not take the penalties with the privileges, nor resign when he fails.

Persistence in this over-loading of the Presidential office with the burdens of legislation will, we think, be bad for Presidents, since it will expose them to new acrimonies, and so lower their dignity; and for Congress, we are certain, it will be worse. Initiative and informed debate and vigilant watchfulness are rare enough already in our legislators. It would be a pity to take away the spur to the exercise of those qualities by strengthening the habit of looking to the White House for the framing as well as the suggestion of laws. If the tendency goes unchecked, there will be more point than ever to the story of the rueful Representative who said: "I was always told that when I entered Congress I should find my level, but I never dreamed what a level it was."

SECRETARY AND PRESIDENT.

"I wired Des Moines yesterday that I would not accept an invitation to speak at Davenport on the evening of June 13, as it necessitates cancelling two important previous engagements. On receipt of your invitation, I conferred with the President, and have decided to cancel the other engagements and accept yours. I will be with you on Wednesday evening.

"L. M. SHAW."

The obvious inference from this dispatch to an anti-Cummins leader is that, with the express approval of the President, Secretary Shaw was cancelling important engagements in order to take a hand in the Iowa fight. But no; the Secretary of the Treasury ingeniously explains that he was merely trying to circumvent a wicked newspaper correspondent who had asserted that Shaw and Roosevelt are not in cordial agreement. The phrase, "I conferred with the President," would prove to all the world that the Secretary and his chief were at least on speaking terms. To all appearances, however, Mr. Shaw's telegram may make the statement of the correspondent come true. President Roosevelt repudiates in his most emphatic style the idea that he has taken sides in the struggle. He "has sent no message"; he "has not interfered, is not now interfering, and will not interfere."

Into the personal aspect of this rebuff it is hardly becoming for an outsider to go. Sensitive Cabinet officers have resigned on hints not nearly so broad. But we are not the keepers of Mr. Shaw's conscience. If his personal dignity allows him to be held up to Iowa and the country as practically a maker of false pretences, we have nothing to say. A Secretary who likes that sort of thing, would like extremely the telegram from the President exposing him in the eyes of all the world. He would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meet the blow with Christian resignation.

There is, however, a public aspect of the matter which concerns us all. Questions of political as well as personal propriety are involved. The whole relation of a Secretary to a President comes in. Is it permissible that a member of the Cabinet should speak on a question of public policy in tones at variance with his chief's? We know what the wholesome precedent has been. Secretaries have not been compelled to think the same thing as Presidents. Their views of national or even of party policy may differ from his, and they may tell him so frankly. It is their duty to give him conscientious advice, even when it goes counter to his preferences. But in public, it has been understood, the Cabinet officer makes no deliverance which has not the approval and does not reflect the opinions of the President. We exclude, of course, all the minor nothings of Secretarial discourse—the happy "home-coming," with greetings to old friends among whom it would be such a pleasure to live and die; the opening of fairs; the purely ceremonial occasions on which the people are so fond of having a "direct representative of the President" in evidence to say the undisputed thing in the solemn way. No one sees impropriety or anything else that signifies in such speeches. But there is a clear difference when one of the President's official family makes a deliberate pronouncement upon an important measure closely affecting public policy, and sharply debated. In such cases, he ought to speak the mind of the President, or else keep still.

This is precisely the irregularity into which Secretary Shaw has fallen. He has made and keeps on making speeches which he ought not to deliver unless as the exponent of the Administration. Yet the head of the Administration openly repudiates him. He, however, goes on as if that made no difference. The excuse that nothing is involved but "factional differences" among Iowa Republicans is hollow. Behind the contest between Gov. Cummins and Mr. Perkins lies a national political question of the highest import. It is intransigeant Dingleyism vs. tariff revision. In going out to campaign against Gov. Cummins, Secretary Shaw becomes by necessity the eulogist of the high tariff and the antagonist of any man who would cut away an inch from one of its schedules. In that rôle he has, in fact, displayed himself. He has taken a positive and uncompromising position on this burning issue, and one that is known to diverge from the President's. In assuring Gov. Cummins's friends that he would not "interfere" to their prejudice, Mr. Roosevelt made it clear that he would do nothing to oppose the triumph of their tariff-revision doctrines. Thus he put himself radically at variance with his Secretary of the Treasury. Such a conflict is, we maintain, improper and mischievous, if not unprecedented.

The voice of the Administration should be single in all such matters. It ought not to give an uncertain sound. When a Secretary goes out to make a carefully prepared speech on matters in political debate, the people are entitled to regard it as an official utterance. So it has been in the past. When Mr. Hay spoke as Secretary of State, or Mr. Root as Secretary of War, they were rightly taken as being the mouthpieces of President McKinley. One cannot imagine Mr. Shaw's predecessor in the Treasury making slap-dash political speeches, getting rapped over the knuckles for them by the President, and then cheerfully saying it didn't count. The rules of the game cannot thus be lightly set aside. The impossibility of conceiving of Mr. Gage or Mr. Carlisle or Mr. Fairchild or Mr. Sherman or any other predecessor of Mr. Shaw's indulging in his hap-hazard methods, shows how violative of sound tradition they are.

President Roosevelt, we presume, lets it go on out of abounding good nature, and in a sort of "free-for-all" idea. He probably looks upon Secretary Shaw's Presidential candidacy with amusement, and thinks it does not matter greatly what such a man says. But it does matter thus to have a wise rule of official propriety trampled upon. We cannot afford to have the Administration made to appear either happy-go-lucky or at cross purposes. So we think that Mr. Roosevelt should end this Shaw comedy, even if by a sudden exit of the leading actor. There ought, at least, to be no occasion next winter to repeat the Gridiron joke of the last: "Secretary Shaw has induced the President to induce him to stay in the Cabinet another year."

CONGRESSIONAL GUARDIANSHIP.

Two comparatively insignificant items in the Indian Appropriation bill have served in a Senate debate to bring out very clearly the point that, when the regular officials of the Government turn a deaf ear to the grafting adventurer, Congress is too often ready to consider his claim. Like the action of last session, when the $750,000 fee of the Choctaw attorneys was allowed by a citizens' court created by Congress, the two items in this year's bill are illustrative of a system that has had many supporters. In the debate, the Senate conferees, who, with the House managers of the bill, brought in the report that was adopted, confessed that neither the Secretary of the Interior nor the Commissioner of Indian Affairs had approved the items. Nevertheless, the Senate agreed to the report, the bill's backers putting the blame for its defects upon the stubborn House conferees. Commissioner Leupp and Secretary Hitchcock, whose special business it is to investigate such claims, were overruled by the efforts of lobbyists; Congress, the sympathetic mother, nullified the wise disciplinary judgment of the Indian Office.

In the case of Andrew Jackson Brown of the Seminole Nation of Indians in Indian Territory, protesting Senators found much instructive material. The Indian Appropriation bill merely attempted to validate the acts of Brown, acting as administrator *de bonis non* of J. D. Jenkins, a special agent of the Interior Department appointed to disburse some $186,000 among the heirs of "loyal" Seminoles who lost property and money in the civil war. As administrator, Brown paid the $186,000 to those adults and minors who proved their right to share. Then, as a member of a trading company into whose debt many of these Seminoles had fallen, Brown proceeded to pay back to himself some $72,000. Some of this came from the estates of minor children whose liability for the debt was in grave doubt.

A brother of the chief of the Seminoles and a kind of Pooh-Bah of the little nation, Brown paid out and took in with lordly indifference to criticism. After a time lawyers were engaged by the Indians to investigate Brown. A technical defect in his appointment as Jenkins's administrator was found. An investigation of Brown's payments and collections was about to be made. He appealed to the Indian Commissioner and the Secretary of the Interior to cure the defect in his title and validate his acts as disbursing agent. After sufficient investigation, both these officials declined to admit his plea. It was at this point that kind Mother Congress was approached. It was nothing but a lawyers' fight, said Brown and his friends. Jenkins was a good man, and so was his administrator *de bonis non*. Complaisant, the Indian committees took the attitude that it was only a few score Indians who might possibly suffer from Brown's methods, while Brown's friends were bothering them terribly. It was easier to give the man what he wanted than to fight as Leupp and Hitchcock urged be done.

Just as Brown was relieved by the bill from the obligation to prove in court that his actions were regular, so in the other case Congress was asked to recognize, and, by inference, recommend, the payment of a claim that the Indian officials had decided should be left to the adjudication of the courts. In 1891 the Government found that a grant made to the Colville Indians in Washington included a white settlement. It was desired to regain possession of 1,500,000 acres, half of the grant, and Congress concluded that, since the grant had been made only on an Executive order, the Indians had not obtained a valid title. The 1,500,000 acres were,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

therefore, opened to settlement. In 1892, a firm of attorneys bargained with the Indians to collect a dollar an acre for the receded land on a 10 per cent. commission. The contract was to stand for ten years. Nothing was done until this year, four years after the lawyers' contract with the Indians expired, when the committees of Congress were convinced that the Colville claim was a valid one. The $1,500,000 was allowed, and the dead contract between the lawyers and the tribe was recognized to the extent of recommending it to the Court of Claims, with a request that the terms be duly considered. Again the officials of the Interior Department were overruled by the lobby.

The theory of the Indian Office is the very sensible one that the Interior Department is capable of looking out for the interests of the Indians. In the Colville case, there was no other difficulty in the way of collecting the claim, once it was investigated, than the delay due to the necessity for not overloading the year's appropriation bill. Neither Mr. Hitchcock nor Mr. Leupp could discover how the lawyers had earned $150,000. But unless the House stands firmer against the item than the Senate did, the Colville case will become a companion exhibit to last year's Choctaw case. When it was decided to break up the tribal holdings in Indian Territory some years ago, 4,000 Choctaws living in Mississippi wanted to share in the division of land and money. Mansfield, McMurray & Cornish, lawyers of South McAlester, agreed to keep these 4,000 claimants out for 9 per cent. of what it would cost the Choctaw Nation to take them in. This cost was estimated to be $20,000,000—a citizenship was valued at $5,000—and when the Mississippi Choctaws were finally ruled out, the lawyers presented their bill for $1,800,000. The Interior Department disapproved the contract, but Congress was appealed to, as usual. For doing what the Department was willing and able to do as part of its regular work, the South McAlester firm was given $750,000 by a citizens' court created to pass upon the claim. In the Senate debate, Mr. La Follette said that "at least one of the members of the court or commission, which was created by special act to pass upon their claim, was a brother-in-law of one of the Senators who supported the legislation establishing the court."

The quality of mercy shown by the Congressional guardians is surely not strained; upon the scheming attorney and the Indian trader it droppeth like the gentle rain of the Cascades. Will the House reject the conference report, and insist upon giving to the decisions of Secretary Hitchcock and Commissioner Leupp the weight they should properly have?

TROUBLING NEW JERSEY.

Jersey Republicans, of the faithful organization type, are looking forward to one of the saddest summers of their lives. Of what avail is it for them to have made an appropriation to keep down mosquitoes, if swarms of Colbyites are to buzz and sting all over the State, from now till November? This threat of an all-summer campaign is terrible to the bosses. The idea is simply appalling to them that the exasperating and infernally successful work done in the summer months of last year by Senator Colby in Essex County, is this year to be extended to Morris and Union and Middlesex and Hudson and other parts of New Jersey. What are clouds of *culex* and *anopheles* compared with the horde of organizers and speakers which the Colby Republican League is preparing to let loose upon the devoted State, to fight it out on that line if it takes all summer?

The Colby movement is admittedly progressing with unexpected rapidity. Wherever its organizers appear, the names of leading Republicans go upon the rolls by the hundred. By "leading Republicans" we mean, of course, not the prominent party workers and office-holders, but the most respectable and influential Republicans in the various localities—the class of men whom the orators are accustomed to point to in proof of the fact that the party embraces the substantial property-owners and the intelligent people of the community. Republicans of this class are going over to the Colby ranks almost in a body. This is conceded by the party hacks. They deplore it, they are angry and bitter about it, yet they cannot deny the fact.

What is its true explanation? At bottom, profound dissatisfaction throughout the Republican party in New Jersey with the methods and personnel of its managers during the past ten years. As soon as Bryan made Democratic New Jersey Republican by 80,000 majority, the Republican machine set out to fasten itself upon the State, and its rule has been mercenary and brainless. It has unblushingly allied itself with unscrupulous corporations, whose pliant tool it was eager to become, and has put the ban upon independence and ability. By its United States Senators ye shall know it. Kean and Dryden! The open way in which those two men, neither of whom would have been thought of but for his wealth and corporation backing, were foisted upon New Jersey Republicans, could not fail to fill the decent members of the party with discontent and disgust. Had the party no honor that was not purse-felt? Had it no men with a voice, that it must select those whose only talking was done by their money? There can be no mistake about this. The delivering of the party over to mere money-bags was felt by reputable Republicans to be an insult and an outrage. It provoked a smouldering revolt which the appearance of a man like Colby was certain to cause to burst into the flame which all men can now see. In its essence, the Colby movement within the Republican party of New Jersey is one of protest against the tyrannical, stupid, and money-grubbing spirit in which the party organization has been conducted. It is a blow full in the face of the Republican bosses.

This fact, indeed, is put in the forefront of the Republican League platform. Its first plank declares for

> "The overthrow of the control of the party organization by corporations through the medium of the bosses, and to that end the nomination of all candidates for public offices by direct primaries without the intervention of delegates or conventions."

That is explicit. It is doubtless to this avowed purpose that so many Republicans of the greatest weight are rallying. Other parts of the programme, though subordinate, are important. One of them is the demand for a "thorough investigation of life-insurance companies." This is aimed at Senator Dryden and the Prudential. The taxation and franchise questions are not so critical as they were before Gov. Stokes and the Legislature capitulated to Senator Colby on those issues last winter. Doubtless much remains to be done to prevent the laws then passed from being ingeniously nullified in execution, and other demands put forward in the name of the Republican League have their interest; but it is undeniable that the movement is gaining the body and impetus which are so troubling the dreams of the Republican bosses, mainly because it is an organized assault upon the old machine, and an appeal for new measures and new men.

Precisely on this score do the innocent Republicans of the organization make their plaint. "They want to destroy our machine in order to build a new one of their own. They want to turn us out of office so as to get in themselves." And then they add that they fear Colby is "ambitious." He wants to be Governor some day. And Mr. Record admits that he should like to be Senator. There you have it—nothing but ambition and office-seeking! Of course, to the Brutuses of the machine, it is a dreadful thing for any one but themselves to have "ambitions." Dryden desires to be reëlected Senator purely in the way of business, we suppose, but for Record to aspire is culpably ambitious. Naturally, Dryden cannot stoop to a joint debate with a man of that sort. Besides, as he remarks in his letter of refusal, he has "other plans" for reaching the people. If the Prudential were ever thoroughly investigated, we might learn something about those plans. Meanwhile, we imagine that the grief of the machine at anybody's actually seeking an office in order to carry out a programme, will merely convince the Colby-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ites that they are on the right track. What the bosses like is a reformer who will emit some fine generalities in May, and then go away, not returning till October to see what the effect is. They do not know what to do with a man who buckles down to a fight all through the hot months, contesting every ward, organizing in every voting division. It is this unprecedented and wholly irregular activity of the Colbyites that is making this summer one of such discontent to the New Jersey Republican bosses, and plunging them into the depths of a divine despair.

DIVORCE TOO DIFFICULT.

The matrimonial infelicities of the head of a great industrial corporation have been freely ventilated in the press. One has been regaled with the future intentions of disagreeing husband and wife, with rumors of the alimony to be arranged and of the names to be "mentioned" or suppressed in the decree. There has been humiliating argument as to the propriety of an unsuccessful husband continuing as the chief of a colossal manufacturing Trust. In short, we have the unedifying spectacle of two people who wish to part, and who are abundantly able to pay the expenses, being subjected to all manner of vexatious delays and invidious publicity. With the divorce laws of forty-odd States to choose from, the farewells of this unfortunate couple still cumber the newspapers and occupy the public sympathy. Could there be a stronger argument against our backward divorce procedure? How long shall we continue to hamper high finance with the matrimonial red tape calculated for an unenterprising bourgeoisie?

We take it that law must in the long run follow the customs of a land. If so, the absurdity of applying the same law to persons whose whole aspect of life—and consequently habits—rests on opposite principles, need not be labored. For your clergyman, mechanic, editor, butcher, baker, and candlestick-maker, the present old-fashioned marriage laws do well enough. These representatives of the plain people seldom look broad-mindedly beyond the stale old words, "until death do us part." Generally speaking, they seldom aspire to more than one living wife at a time. In their unimaginative way, they make the best even of a matrimonial bad bargain, and contentedly pursue the plodding task of domestic compromise and adjustment. Evidently, the most liberal laws could do little for people of this bread-and-butter disposition. Moreover, even were their philosophy the most enlightened, few of these submerged husbands could afford more than one wife. Many find it difficult to maintain a single helpmate in reasonable comfort and dignity. The wives, too, rarely have the habit of the great world. They live too near the pots and pans, vesper services, and the lecture-room to pick up new "affinities" with any ease or grace. In short, they are in no sense "in the movement." Many incorrigibly prefer their own prosaic John to the most sympathetic Algernon that ever was unhappily married to another woman. What could the most liberal law do for those whose means do not permit an alimony account, and whose instincts are fanatically monogamous?

Consider only that divorce remains the sole commodity that great wealth cannot buy quickly and surely. When two persons sincerely desire to part, and are amply able to pay for the damaged sensibilities concerned, why should either be forced to commit constructive desertion, to make unpleasant admissions *in camera*, to establish fictitious residences in remote and dismal parts of the country? Why, in short, should the Constitutional right to the "pursuit of happiness" be clouded and qualified by the scruples of backwoods legislators, not a handful of whom have had any practical experience in the matter? Let Congress provide a quick, quiet, and easy method of changing life partners, applicable, naturally, only to those of approved financial responsibility. The figure we decline to fix, but it fails evidently about where Mr. Roosevelt's "bloated fortunes" begin.

The details of the reform we leave to the associations that exist for that purpose. To many, the Roman law of divorce by mutual consent may seem an admirable model, but it might easily be improved upon, affording as it does no recourse against the rare but possible contingency of a disobligingly attached husband or wife. The essence of the matter is, however, due provision for divorce at the time of marriage. By an amazingly slipshod procedure, unpardonable in any similarly important transaction, the divorcing classes are still guilty of using words which regard the marital vow as perpetual. Here the approved principle of forfeiture should apply. Let the service read, "until death or the courts do us part." Well begun is half done, and a wedding solemnized in this spirit may be said to be already in sight of an easy, equitable, and painless divorce. Good taste would forbid the mention of the hypothetical alimony in the ritual, but a miniature bond of indemnity could be conveyed unobtrusively by the first usher to the bride's counsel at the moment the best man proffers the ring.

We have already admitted the drawback that the reform, though nominally available for all, must practically be in the nature of class legislation. We can, however, conceive of a campaign of education by which divorce might be gradually made available even for the bourgeoisie—whose general incapacity we have been forced to concede. It is obvious that your mere counter-jumper cannot enter into a personal obligation for alimony on his wedding-day that deserves serious consideration. But here is an open field for divorce underwriting. The risk could be ascertained by actuarial calculation. The business might be a profitable side venture for building and loan associations, and bond or indemnity companies. One could imagine a combination life, endowment, accident, sickness, homestead, burial, and divorce policy that might at once rehabilitate a flagging business, and gradually extend the blessings of experimental marriage to the very proletariat.

THE RELIGIOUS QUESTION AND ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN ENGLAND.

LONDON, June 5, 1906.

Why is it that every attempt to establish a satisfactory system of elementary education for the people of England is hampered by the so-called "religious question"? This inquiry must often puzzle the readers of the *Nation;* it is the more perplexing because a problem which is really nothing else than the difficulty of determining what (if any) form of religion shall be taught in elementary schools supported by the State, has been met more or less satisfactorily not only in many English-speaking colonies, but in Scotland and even in Ireland. My aim, then, in this letter is neither to criticise the educational policy of the Ministry nor to discuss the provisions of the Education Bill now before Parliament, but simply to answer the question which opens this letter.

The existence of the "religious question" has little connection either with the undoubted advance of democracy or with the very doubtful prevalence of skepticism. Democratic government is compatible with either a religious or a secular view of life. Tocqueville was deeply impressed with the influence of religion in the United States; the democrats of modern France can see in the most ordinary emblems of Christianity nothing but the signs of reaction and superstition. There is, again, little reason to suppose that any large body of Englishmen are out-and-out secularists. Convinced Churchmen and orthodox Dissenters possess far greater Parliamentary authority than can be attributed to skeptics or agnostics. The religious difficulty is due not to one but to various complex causes which are so peculiar to England that they do not to any great degree impede the development of popular education in Scotland.

The confusion into which the English educational system has fallen is, as most persons will now admit, due to a blunder committed more than seventy years ago. In 1833 the House of Commons made a grant of not quite £20,000 to promote the education of the people of England. The money was spent on a sort of subscription to two societies supported by voluntary contributions, of which the one represented the Church of England and the other Nonconformists. From this thoughtless, hap-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hazard way of doing something to lessen the gross ignorance of the English people sprang that State-supported, yet to a great extent denominational, scheme of national education which thoughtful men of all parties feel imperatively needs reform. Happy would it have been for the country had the crude but comprehensive scheme proposed by Brougham some fourteen years earlier been adopted. That its adoption was, as things then stood, impossible, every one must admit, but it would have provided a general plan of national education which would easily have admitted of amendment. The blunder, however, of 1833 was natural, not to say inevitable. Its commission was the outward and visible sign of the conditions which have made and still make the education of the English people the field of futile and noxious controversy. These may be summed up under a few heads—the position of the Established Church; the effect produced by the ecclesiastical movement of 1834; the peculiar condition of public opinion with regard to the proper sphere of the State's activity.

The position of the Church of England is a practical paradox: the Established Church both is and is not the Church of the English people. From a Churchman's point of view its national character is obvious. The mere fact that the Church remains established, *i. e.*, that, with the full assent of the majority of the electors, it retains as the national church large revenues and exceptional privileges, is, as things now stand, strong evidence that the Church commands the respect of the English people. The opposition by Nonconformists to a religious census amounts to proof that a majority of the people of England consider themselves to be Churchmen. The legal doctrine that every Englishman is *prima-facie* a member of the Church as by law established, may be a fiction, but it is a fiction based on a considerable foundation of fact. The persons who, were a census taken, would describe themselves as members of the Church of England, have at lowest no wish to join any other religious society. While quiet transitions from Chapel to Church are common, the conversion of Churchmen to any form of Protestant nonconformity is rare, and this is a circumstance of untold significance. Whatever, moreover, be the creed of an English layman, every rector or curate who values a national church acknowledges the right of all parishioners to his services—of every parishioner who wishes to receive them. A Nonconformist minister, however great his zeal or his eloquence, is the minister of a sect whose members are bound together by holding some special form of religious doctrine. A rector is the minister not of Churchmen, but of the parish. No man more completely commanded the reverence of his disciples and the respect of his opponents than James Martineau, but a study of Martineau's life brings home to one the conviction that he never escaped from a sense of the fatal limits placed to the beneficial action of a religious teacher whose congregation consisted of persons having for their bond of union nothing but common belief in some given dogma.

But though, looked at from one point of view, the Church of England can make a claim to a truly national character, no Nonconformist can fail to look at the matter from a different side, and to perceive that the Established Church is nothing like the church of the whole of the English people. English Dissenters form a large and powerful body, and a man whose convictions induce him to stand apart from the religious community which includes most of his countrymen, is likely to be a more zealous believer in his particular form of faith than is the average Churchman. Legislation, moreover, has not only established complete legality for Nonconformity, but has relieved Dissenters from almost every form of political inequality. But this salutary establishment of religious freedom has in some respects increased the division between Church and Chapel. To the grave injury both of the Established Church and of religion itself, theological have become associated with social differences, and Churchmanship has become a mark of gentility. Snobbishness has penetrated into a sphere which ought to be kept sacred to religion. Can any one wonder that, under this state of things, the clergy who have been zealous in erecting denominational schools should look upon national control of public education as a triumph of Nonconformists over the national Church, or that Dissenting opinion should be morbidly alive to the possibility that religion may be so taught in schools supported by the nation as to be the means of inculcating belief in the doctrines of the Established Church?

The High Church movement of 1834 has produced two effects, each of which complicates the educational problem. It has in the first place thrown into the background the Protestant character of the Established Church, which in the earlier part of the nineteenth century was in reality closely allied with orthodox Dissenters by their common Protestantism. Robert Hall,* the eminent Baptist minister, was the most famous preacher of his day. His chapel was attended by Evangelical Churchmen. Alexander Knox, who in some respects anticipated the Oxford Movement of 1834, believed, as early as 1806, that a thorough change was taking place in the sentiment of the great body of Dissenters which would bring them round to a truer Church of England spirit than ever their conformist ancestors were possessed of, and based this belief in part on the character of Robert Hall's writings; while Robert Hall himself taught that the differences which divided Dissenters from their brethren in the Establishment did not touch the essentials of Christianity, and preached on behalf of those national schools which were founded to promote the education of the poor in the principles of the Established Church. This harmony of sentiment, based on common Protestantism, has been destroyed by a movement of which the object was to proclaim the Catholic character of the Anglican Church.

This movement, in the second place, has introduced division among Churchmen. The laymen to whose support the Establishment owes its continued existence, are for the most part Protestants, both in belief and in sentiment. The clergy are Anglicans or Catholics, and their teaching is often regarded with profound distrust by laymen belonging to the Church of England. Hence, a curious misconception as to the real state of religious (or rather theological) belief in England. The country is in appearance divided into Churchmen and Nonconformists, and on all sides one hears expressions used which imply that at the present moment, and at any rate as regards the teaching of religion in State-supported schools, Churchmen are united against Dissenters. But this view of the case does not correspond with patent facts. The true line of division is not between Churchmen and Dissenters, but between a powerful minority consisting of High Churchmen and of Roman Catholics who may fairly and without offence be described as "Catholics," and the vast majority of English laymen, who, whether they worship in Church or in Chapel, or perhaps do not worship in either Church or Chapel with great regularity, may fairly be termed Protestants. The real problem (and it is difficult enough) with which statesmen are called upon to deal, is how to provide elementary education for the people combined with the kind of religious teaching demanded by a Protestant majority with due and careful respect for the rights of what I may venture to call a Catholic minority, whose members demand (and from their own point of view fairly enough) the maintenance of a religious atmosphere—as the expression goes—of a character which cannot be found in any school where no religion is taught except the essential elements of Christianity, common at any rate to Churchmen and orthodox Dissenters.

Difficulties due either to the paradoxical position of the Established Church or to the results of the High Church movement, are complicated by a singular condition of public opinion in regard to the proper action and the moral authority of the State. The old Liberalism which rested upon faith in *laissez-faire* had the closest connection with the belief that the Government should, as a general rule, neither control nor direct public opinion, at any rate in matters of religion. A policy grounded on this belief certainly minimized the risk of conflicts between the commands of the State—or, in other words, the law of the land—and the conscientious scruples of minorities. It also fostered the idea that, in such contests, minorities or individuals were probably in the right, and could hardly with fairness be punished for conscientious disobedience to the law. But this idea or sentiment has survived the creed of which it was the natural or necessary outcome. We all of us, in different ways, demand the extension of the State's authority, which, after all, is nothing else than the diminution of the area of individual freedom or caprice. Hence, of necessity, conflicts between law and the conscience or crotchets of individuals. A Christian scientist who is also a doctor, insists upon his right or his duty to let his patient perish because the physician disbelieves in the use of medicine. An anti-vaccinator demands the privilege of leaving his children unvaccinated. A woman stands a siege rather than pay taxes imposed by a Parliament in which she is unrepresented. A passive-resister refuses to support as a rate-payer a form of religious teaching which he has uncomplainingly supported as a tax-payer; and the

*See Canon Henson's 'Religion in the Schools.'

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public, combining the aspirations of Socialism with the sentiment of individualism, wishes that the State should regulate all things, and yet that the conscientious resistance of individuals should be allowed to hamper the action of the State: The very politicians who more or less sympathized with the passive resistance to the existing Education Act of conscientious Nonconformists, must occasionally dread the possibility that the Education Act, 1906, may be more or less nullified by the conscientious (though, to my mind, unjustifiable and ill-advised) passive resistance of conscientious Churchmen.

AN OBSERVER.

JAPAN'S POST-BELLUM POLICY FORESHADOWED.

TOKYO, May 17, 1906.

The working life of Japan's first post-bellum Diet was little more than two months, yet rarely has a national legislature in one session enacted so many laws. Most vital and far-reaching among them, besides the budgetary schemes, are (I.) a law to nationalize most private railways, and (II.) a revised customs-tariff law. The fate of these two laws, like that of the budgetary measures, was decided in committee and in party councils.

(I.) In 1872, the Government began to operate the first railway in Japan. Strangers to the order in which railways are a factor, the people left the enterprise wholly to Government. The Government, with similar tasks of initiative in most branches of industry, lacked capital and trained men. By 1883 the Government was working 150 miles of railway when the first private company took hold. Thereafter Government and private companies built lines in a national system planned by the Government. In March, 1906, there were open to traffic 4,783 miles, of which the Government had 1,532 miles, and 37 private companies had 3,251 miles. The beginning of private railways brought an unsuccessful movement for the State to sell its lines. Later, several attempts were made to nationalize the private lines —the last and strongest in 1900.

Having parried questions in committee concerning rumored plans to nationalize private railways, the ministry brought forward its proposal March 6. The resignation of the Foreign Minister four days earlier had prepared Diet and nation for it. The plan was to buy, within five years, 32 railways (3,160 miles) at a price equal to twenty times average profits for three years, payment to be made with 5 per cent. thirty-year bonds at par, and deliverable within two years after purchase. The bill came from committee March 16, and, after four hours' debate, passed the Lower House by a vote of 243 to 109. The Upper House committee made amendments which eliminated 15 railways (353.5 miles), prolonged the purchase period to ten years, made purchase-bonds in exchange for shares deliverable within five years after purchase, and in certain cases gave right of appeal against prices fixed by the valuation committee. The amended bill passed the Upper House March 26: vote, 205 to 62. On March 31, a few hours before the legal limit to the session, the Lower House committee reported it for passage as amended. Refusal to allow discussion caused a scene of violence, after which—the Opposition declining to vote—the amended bill received 214 affirmative votes.

The law empowers the Government to buy seventeen railways. Their total mileage is 2,806.6 miles, of which 2,538 miles belong to six companies. The estimated cost now is about 425 millions, but further sums spent for improvements and extensions before purchase must be added. Lines may be bought at the discretion of the Government within ten years. The price is in each case to be a sum equal to twenty times average net profits for three years (1902-05). New lines and lines which have not paid dividends will be valued, within cost of construction limits, by a special commission. Against the price so fixed, appeal may be made to the Minister of Communications. Payment is to be made in the form of 5 per cent. thirty-year bonds at face value; such bonds to be delivered to shareholders at the option of the Government within five years from the date of purchase. Between date of purchase and delivery of bonds, shareholders receive, in semi-annual payments, the 5 per cent. interest on bonds due them. Payment for supplies on hand must be made with bonds at their market value. Pending purchase, companies must under penalty make repairs and improvements required by existing law, must carry on their business under Government supervision, and get Government sanction for purchase of supplies or for increasing or diminishing construction costs. They may not amalgamate or buy other lines. A separate and similar law empowers the Government to buy the railways in Korea, the estimated cost being about 34 million yen.

Sums spent on construction and equipment of the seventeen home lines average about 55 per cent. of the face value of bonds receivable in payment, but the extreme range for the several lines is from 34 per cent. to 347 per cent. For the six largest companies, the ratio of cost to face value of bonds receivable is respectively 41.7 per cent., 52.6 per cent., 49.6 per cent., 87.7 per cent., 40.1 per cent., 100 per cent. Eight companies will get bonds whose face value is less than cost of construction and equipment, but only two of them have more than fifty miles of line.

Reasons given by the Government for purchase were: To use a favorable opportunity to realize the "traditional policy" of State ownership of railways; to make railway service uniform, more efficient, cheaper; to promote industries and trade; to get the profits for the State; necessity for military efficiency. Opponents urged that Government railways now charge higher rates, have more costly and less efficient management than private railways, that the Government would raise rates to get profits, and so hinder the growth of industries and trade; that, in the recent war, the Government had practical control of private railways and got efficient services, while it also has by law full power to enforce on private companies needful changes or improvements; that the cost of nationalization would, under existing conditions, have grave effects on national credit, especially abroad; that, having chartered companies for fixed terms, the Government has not the right to buy lines before the end of charter-terms except at a price acceptable to the companies. The last argument—viz., unconstitutionality to force sale at a fixed price—was based on Article XXVII. of the Constitution, which says:

"The right of property of every Japanese subject shall remain inviolate.

"Measures necessary to be taken for the public benefit shall be provided by law."

The Government's answer to this argument was that railway charters were granted by law, and can for the public benefit be changed or ended by law. The inexpediency of enforcing this view, together with solicitude about the costs and the effects on national credit of railway nationalization, had led Mr. Kato, Foreign Minister, to resign.

(II.) The new tariff law—enacted in March, effective October 1—followed no "campaign of education," was marked by no "bitter contests" over schedules. Neither "vested interests" nor burdened consumers were much in evidence. The press and some sections of the people were busy assaulting sinking fund, war-tax continuation, railway nationalization, silk inspection, habutai bleaching, match-monopoly schemes of the Government. The Government's position was strong because its plans were hardly known before they were urged in the Diet. Hence, the Opposition had in a short campaign to distribute its forces over a long line of simultaneous attack. Finally, the heart of opposition was weakened by the feeling that absence of expected indemnity, a huge new debt, and plans to reap large fruits from victory made inevitable unusual fiscal and other measures. So the Government got its tariff law easily, quietly, by merely assenting to some minor changes of rate—mostly protective increases—in the Diet.

The main features of the law are these: (1) The Government may by decree convert ad-valorem into specific duties, using as a basis the average value for a period of six months or more. Tare may be included in fixing specific duties. (2) Valuation for assessment of duties includes original cost, together with costs of packing, transportation, insurance, and other charges to the port of entry. (3) Duties may be wholly or partly refunded when paid on materials which are further manufactured and reëxported, or when paid on materials which are used to make land fertilizer (even for use at home). (4) In the case of countries which have not conventional tariff rights, the Government may by decree impose on their products duties not lower than those fixed in the conventional tariffs. (5) Products of countries which discriminate against Japanese products or ships may be subjected to additional duties up to 100 per cent. of the usual rates on dutiable, 50 per cent. on duty-free goods. (6) Countervailing duties may be used to offset export bounties for imported goods. (7) The law designates 800 kinds of goods, of which 45 are duty-free. Duty-free goods are mostly plants, bristles, shells, bones, potash, ammonia, cotton, mineral ores, manures, various waste products—the rawest exotic materials and fertilizers. Many goods are for the first time dutiable. Most duties on agricultural and manufactured products are increased, even beyond the rates fixed by the war. Typical duties are (approximately equivalent ad-valorem rates): horses 5 per cent., cattle

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

10 per cent., other animals 25 per cent., cereal grains about 15 per cent., flour, meals, meats, 30-40 per cent; most tinned provisions and those preserved with sugar 40-50 per cent.; coffee, cocoa, chocolate, 45 per cent.; railway and tramway carriages, carts, drays, balances, sewing machines, 20 per cent.; bicycles, clocks, brushes, matches, boots, shoes, harness, hats, fire-arms, musical instruments, 40 per cent.; carriages, photographic apparatus, toilet articles, games, and accessories, furs, feathers, gold or silver trimmed articles, 50 per cent.; pearls, gold pens, jewelry, perfumery, 60 per cent.; wines and liquors 60-150 per cent.; manufactures of tobacco 250 per cent. In general, crude agricultural products producible at home 15-25 per cent.; coarse manufactures of metals and wood about 20-30 per cent.; those more refined, also ordinary textile, leather, and paper manufactures, 30-40 per cent.; the best grades of these, also of foods and luxuries, 40-50 per cent.; special luxuries and revenue-yielding articles, above 50 per cent. Long-distance transportation costs and low earnings of Japanese make these rates relatively heavier than they would be for Americans or Europeans.

By this law, Japan stocks her commercial armory with the latest tariff weapons, systematizes her duties largely on the basis of the specific principle lately in favor, and takes a long stride in her quick progress towards high protective-tariff duties since in 1898 she left the 5 per cent. treaty-maximum. The motives for all this are not solely in the war; neither are they elaborately set forth by the Government, which, as usual, prefers results rather than talk. The Government explained that the existing law was defective in some points, hinted that some protection might be good for home industries, and emphasized the necessity of proposed amendments because of change in the "economic situation." Analysis of this rather typical argument, if deemed necessary, would have shown mixed motives. Some increase of ante-bellum tariff rates is needed to offset high internal taxes and avoid handicapping home producers. But, besides the wish for more revenue and still more effective, all-round protection for home producers, it would not be amiss to scale down payments for imports or else make them contribute handsomely towards the large interest balances due abroad—for it must cause concern that, with exports of some 320 million yen, Japan must pay foreigners 90 to 100 million yen yearly interest. In negotiating commercial treaties to replace four years hence those now existing, the new scale of duties—of which further revision then is promised—may be a strong argument in Japan's favor. Finally, to the Japanese mind, there is satisfaction in the thought that the tariff system is scientific, consistent, and in every feature "up to date." The effectiveness of the law for both revenue and protective purposes is limited by existing commercial treaties. Rates fixed by those treaties must continue till 1910-11. They apply to most textile goods, metals other than brass and copper, wines, and some other products. The purpose is not to impose higher duties on products of non-treaty countries.

(III.) Meanwhile, by exhortation, experiment, subsidies, regulation, and every practicable means, the Government tries to raise productive industries to the highest efficiency for supplying home demand and swelling the volume of exports. Thus, questions in committee concerning iron and steel schedules elicited the frank statement that rates on some of them were made specially high because, while capable of production at home, they were still imported; rates on others were made high in the hope that, after the treaties' end, 35 per cent. duties would make it possible to produce them at home. The Government iron and steel factories have been built up by direct appropriations of the Diet, which continue yearly, and on plans which contemplate production of the whole supply of iron and steel products at home. Similarly, it is said that, with a view to improve the quality of silks for export, the Government proposes to buy the best silk-weaving machinery and lend it to silk manufacturers; that, with a view to develop the sugar industry in the Loochoo Islands, the Government has established an office to conduct experiments and model enterprises in cultivating and manufacturing sugar and to teach the best methods. A new law reorganizing with foreign coöperation the Industrial Bank (crédit-mobilier) is intended to open a channel through which cheap foreign capital may flow into needy enterprises, and the Government is advising companies and municipalities how best to profit thereby. Back of almost every promising industry and branch of trade are the guiding, supporting, bounty-giving hand and the directing intelligence of an omnipresent Government. Somewhat along this line were Government proposals to limit all bleaching of habutai to factories designated by Government and to establish Government agencies for the compulsory inspection of all silk intended for export. The latter proposal was rejected, the former emasculated by the Diet. These actions and much sharp criticism seemingly dissuaded the Government from bringing forward plans already matured to grant to a combination organized by Government suggestion the exclusive right to manufacture matches. Fees or profits for the Treasury are a usual feature of such projects, which seem to be parts of a single policy that aims to get revenues and to foster and guide the growth of almost every branch of industry and trade, to realize a *Solidarschutzsystem*. Here is where railway nationalization seems to fit in—an enterprise which Ministers have frequently declared to be the basis of all post-bellum policy.

What will be the outcome? Predilections for or against the efficacy of Government in economic rôles and for or against the wisdom in constitutional government of large sources of income beyond immediate control of Parliament all aside, there are factors here which a Westerner cannot easily judge. Japan does not produce enough food for her people. In 1903 and 1904, both years of big crops, the excess value of rice imports over exports was 47 and 54 million yen respectively. Barley, wheat, and flour together, with almost no exports, show import values for those years of 15 and 11 million yen. The 15 per cent. duty on these staples of food for the masses must be wholly added to the cost of living—for the price of the home product must rise proportionally in the face of regular imports. Again, as compared with Americans and Europeans, Japanese laborers earn less and pay proportionally much heavier taxes. Skilled artisans earn 20 to 40 cents a day. On the basis of a recent Government estimate of national wealth, yearly taxes amount to 2 1-3 per cent. of the whole sum of wealth. Hence the cost of living must rise, and with it wages. But that means higher cost of producing goods for export. Thus a new handicap on the export trade is added to want of sufficiently skilled and experienced workmen in machine industries and want of capital to provide efficient plant and equipment. But ages have accustomed Japanese to heavy taxes and to obedience. They have always looked to Government for initiative. In the new order, the Government built the first railways and factories, supplied capital or guidance for every variety of new enterprise, paid for the education of experts abroad, and had them patiently teach the people how in every field of activity to grow the seeds of the new civilization. It still is doing so. The Meiji Government has thus led the people to unwonted liberty, prosperity, enlightenment, happiness, even glory. Its hold on the people enables it to do what no Western Government would dare try. Perhaps, also, the people have not the bent or training to govern as Western people do.

The feeling grows that Japan must work out her own salvation in her own way. She sees the West struggling with its problems: labor against capital, capital to control government, the United States against Trusts and the railways. Pressed for need of capital, she would yet keep control over it. Hence the seeming paradox that while the West struggles against Trusts, Japan tries to create them. But, in adopting and using the economic forces discovered in the West, Japan would like to force from the West an avowal of her superior use of them, just as she won praise for her use of Western weapons of war! Meanwhile, the war has infused new confidence, new ambitions in the people, a new spirit of daring in the Government. The Government, alert and energetic, would utilize the expansive mood of the people to get far on the chosen way before burdens seem heavy. Daring is an element of statesmanship as of business. Failure alone is called folly, and comes from misjudgment of capacities or conjunctures. If Japan's policy succeeds, her present leaders will go down through history as great empire-builders.

E. H. Vickers.

Correspondence.

THE BLESSED WORD "NATIONAL."

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The opening short editorial and the longer article headed "Ways of 'Regenerating Business,'" in your issue of June 7, raise the old question of the difference between the execution of laws and inspection of conditions by local and by national authorities.

Do not the reports, in Sunday's daily papers, of the intention of Chicago to investigate the conditions [with a whitewash

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brush], and so to put a stop to injuries to Chicago's business, show what may be expected of local inspection? Is not the difference between local enforcement of local-option high-license liquor laws in most parts of this country and national enforcement of national license laws a fair indication of the difference to be expected between a "rigid" inspection by Chicago municipal authorities under the shadow of the mighty Trust's wings, and inspection by officials of the National Government?

Does not your argument itself convict your plan of insufficiency? You begin by truly asserting that there is no shortcut substitute for "the old, painful road of repentance and restitution and a sober and godly life." You admit the short-sighted greed of the guilty; and yet you expect their whole attitude to change in a moment, so that they will be far-sighted and wise enough to adopt the highest standards of business conduct.

The people cannot inspect and know for themselves the quality of what they eat, and, so long as the packers can maintain their monopoly in this country, by whatever means, the people are at their mercy. The New York municipal milk inspection has done much to protect New York milk users. Would you transfer this inspection to the officials of the counties where the milk is produced?

If the United States Government has power to require that all food products be submitted to efficient inspection before being admitted to interstate commerce, why then turn over the protection of the consumers of this whole nation to Chicago's notoriously corrupt officials, dominated by the short-sighted greed of the "Beef Trust"? If it were merely a question of punishment of greed, we might leave it to the working of natural laws; but the old adage applies here, "God helps those who help themselves." Chicago will look out for itself, but not for the rest of us. Let our President, whom we elected, by all Constitutional means protect us from filth and poison.

CONSUMER.

STAMFORD, CONN., June 12, 1906.

[We are quite willing that our readers should pass upon these interrogatories in their or in our own behalf.—ED. NATION.]

ANOTHER MILWAUKEE PUBLICATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: A concern which calls itself the "University Research Extension," E. Milton Jones, secretary, with offices in the Auditorium Building, Chicago, has for some time been exploiting a set of volumes published by the Roberts-Manchester Co., of Milwaukee, entitled "The Ideas That Have Made Civilization." "The University Research Extension," which has very aptly taken as its motto "Your only real property is the capacity to make mental efforts," seems to consist of some enterprising persons who possess this capacity in a remarkable degree, to judge by their methods of exploitation and the pompous phraseology of their letters and circulars, in which they announce this as "the culmination of a world-wide movement in University Circles," and offer the books, along with "membership," "only to people recognized or recommended as careful students and thoughtful readers." Every occasion is taken to proclaim the fact that the editor-in-chief has been "assisted by more than one hundred and twenty-five men, specialists in their own fields, such as the following: A. H. Sayce, Crawford H. Toy, Edward Capps, Walter Miller, H. D. Foster, Henry Rushton Fairclough, Frank Frost Abbott, John Carew Rolfe, Dana C. Monro, Edward G. Bourne, Ferdinand Schwill, Harry Burns Hutchins, William H. Welch, Theodore William Richards, Paul Reinsch, George Goodspeed." Still others are mentioned in the "Editorial Acknowledgment" prefixed to each volume, with the same implication.

We are informed by the editor-in-chief that he did not write the editorial acknowledgment, did not authorize the use of these names, had never been aware that these persons were members of his "staff of associates and coworkers" in connection with this editorial work, and that he has protested vigorously but in vain against the unauthorized and misleading statements made by the promoters of the scheme in this connection.

The undersigned, having made ineffectual efforts to put a stop to the use of their names in connection with this work, take this means of informing the public that they have had no connection whatever, editorially, financially, or advisory, with this publication or its promoters—that they were not upon the "staff" of advisers of the editor nor sustained any editorial or advisory relation to him, and protest emphatically against the dishonest representation made in exploiting it, so far as they are concerned. They are informed, further, that others in the above list, no telling how many, have had as little responsibility for the publication as they.

H. R. FAIRCLOUGH,
ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER,
J. C. ROLFE,
EDWARD CAPPS.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, June 11, 1906.

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS AND GERMANY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Melville E. Stone of the Associated Press misunderstood me. As far as my very limited understanding goes, the Associated Press collects news through its agents and distributes this daily budget to its various customers. Whether the news be true or untrue is not its business. The only case in which fault could be found with the Associated Press would be if it were guilty of *culpa in eligendo*, for instance, if the association had entrusted a man with the collection of information in a certain district who notoriously and manifestly was unfit to be trusted, and, instead of being a matter-of-fact man, proves to be what Charles Lamb facetiously called a matter-of-lie man. Such mistakes may occur in the best-regulated families.

As to my statement, that of all the news spread broadcast over the world by the Associated Press for many years about German political affairs more than 90 per cent. was absolute falsehoods made up for no other purpose than to stir up distrust and hatred against Germany, I propose a test easy to be made by any man of good will; for the proof of the pudding is in the eating. My humble suggestion therefore is, that Mr. Melville E. Stone or *quivis ex populo* may take up any newspaper published at New York or elsewhere in this country during our last unpleasantness with Spain, and read over the news communicated to that paper by the Associated Press regarding the attitude of the German Government towards our country. After this performance, the kind reader is requested to look over what Mr. Andrew D. White has to say about the same question: I presume that Mr. Melville E. Stone will not deny that Mr. White, who at that time was our ambassador at Berlin, knows what he is talking about, and that he is a competent witness whose testimony would be received as unimpeachable evidence by any court in this or any other country.

The result of this investigation, I trust, will be that the kind reader cannot help coming to the conclusion that either Mr. White or the originator of those Associated Press dispatches, not the Associated Press, has committed an intentional violation of truth. Q. E. D.

Respectfully yours,
E. SCHRADER.

SPOKANE, WASH., June 10, 1906.

Notes.

A work of much prospective interest, 'The Criminal Prosecution and Capital Punishment of Criminals,' by our countryman, Prof. E. P. Evans, long resident in Bavaria, will be shortly issued by William Heinemann, London.

Dr. B. P. Grenfell and Dr. A. S. Hunt are hard at work on their new book (Hiteh Papyri, Part I.), which is to be put out in July by the Egypt Exploration Fund (37 Great Russell Street, London, W. C.). It will represent the publications of two years, since, owing doubtless to lack of funds, no volume was issued last summer by the Græco-Roman branch. It is hoped that early this fall the learned excavators will bring out the fragment of the lost Gospel, the most conspicuous of the finds of their last season. This document, which relates to a visit of Jesus and his disciples to the Temple at Jerusalem, and their meeting with a Pharisee, is declared to be genuine by no less an authority than Prof. D. S. Margoliouth.

One who takes up the 'Statesman's Year-Book' for 1906 (Macmillan) will be struck first by the increased bulk, and next by the numerous interesting maps grouped at the beginning. Surprise (for an American) will set in on finding the United States in the forefront of the nations statistically and politically considered: the British Empire following. He may then turn back to the editorial introduction to learn that, in a spirit of Pan-Anglo-Saxon brotherhood, the two English-speaking empires are hereafter to be in immediate juxtaposition in this Year-Book—the order being properly reversed, however, in the case of the British edition. Furthermore—and this is a very significant and valuable innovation—the United States begins to be treated by States and Territories (like Germany, for example), and no longer simply in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gross. Each State has prefixed a brief sketch of its history and of its constitutional machinery; then come sections on area and population, justice and charity, finance, production, etc., each closing with a list of books of reference. By this happy thought, the editor of the Year-Book has confirmed its necessity to every American publicist, politician, and journalist, and to every private as well as public library.

There is nothing of the glamour of the prestige of the Clarendon Press about the sturdy, compact, inexpensive little 6x4 series of "The World's Classics," pushed now nearly to the eighty mark (New York: Henry Frowde). Still, it is a boon to have, say, Borrow's 'Bible in Spain' in one volume, and along with it to get Chaucer's Poems (in several), Anne Brontë's 'Tenant of Wildfell Hall,' Thoreau's 'Walden,' and 'Twenty-three Tales by Tolstoy,' competently translated by L. and A. Maude—viz., Tales for Children (1872), Popular Stories, A Fairy Tale, Stories Written to Pictures, Folk-tales Retold (mostly in the eighties), Adaptations from the French (1893, 1897), Stories given to aid the persecuted Jews (1903). This is plain, useful popularization, and we are glad the Press is not above it.

The 'Personal Narrative' of Elias Pym Fordham makes a worthy addition to the series of volumes on 'Early Western Travel' published by the Arthur H. Clark Co. of Cleveland. During the years 1817 and 1818, Mr. Fordham passed through Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky, and resided for a time in the Territory of Illinois. Late in 1818, while Fordham was still in Illinois, a member of his family in England made a series of selections from his letters to home friends, with a view to immediate publication, but this intention was never carried out. One regrets the wholesale suppression of proper names by this early editor, though the value of Mr. Fordham's letters does not often depend upon the identity of the friends to whom they were addressed. The manuscript fell into the hands of Dr. Hubert de Laserre Spence of Cleveland, a grandson of Mr. Fordham's sister, who accompanied him on his voyage and became the wife of Charles de la Serre, a Frenchman whom she met in the Wabash country. Through Dr. Spence, the present editor, Prof. Frederic Austin Ogg, has been able to establish the authorship of the letters and to add interesting matter concerning Mr. Fordham and his family.

For the same series, Frank H. Hodder of the University of Kansas has edited John W. Audubon's journal of his trip from New York to Texas, and thence through Mexico and Arizona to the California goldfields, in 1849-1850. A biographical memoir of this son of the great naturalist is furnished by his daughter Maria. In its accumulation of misfortunes and its record of ultimate failure, the narrative is an excellent illustration of the average experience of the multitudes who flocked to California in the delirium of the gold fever of 1849. Aside from the failure of the company to realize their expectations in the search for gold, Mr. Audubon's personal hope for valuable material on birds and mammals was frustrated, since his sketches were ultimately lost in the wreck of the steamer *Central America*.

The new volume of Vernon Lee's 'Hauntings' in John Lane's uniform edition of this author's works contains no addition to the four fantastic tales which first appeared in magazine form and were afterwards published together under their present appropriate title. They are subtly devised ghost stories, in which sub-conscious influences or impressions of events and crimes which have happened ages ago, affect and direct the lives of people of other epochs through the chances of heredity or of affinities of taste or choice. They are pure invention, and contain delightful descriptions of imaginary people who become real to the reader through their definite characterization; their surroundings also leave the impression of places we have been in, so that the supernatural tells all the more grewsomely through its realistic setting. Vernon Lee has never given us more accurate and delightful descriptive pages of Italian people and country than in the tale of "Dionea of Montemirto Ligure," or of the simple conditions and bareness of modern Italian life in a provincial town, interwoven with the ancient splendor of antique and mediæval remains, than in "Amour Dure," the most interesting of the four tales. In "Oke of Okehurst" the scene is laid in an old English manor house with essentially English people and traditions; here suggestion leads to a tragic dénoûment. We recommend these tales of mystery and romance to those who are a little weary of the analytical and impressionist method, and who crave for a beginning and an end and some happenings in a story.

The third volume of Mr. Charles Evans's 'American Bibliography,' covering the years 1751 to 1764, has just been issued, though bearing the imprint 1905. It contains titles 6624 to 9890, the first book recorded being: 'An Account of the Robberies Committed by John Morrison and his Accomplices, in and near Philadelphia, 1750,' and the last: 'Zwey wahrhafte neue Zeitungen von gantz besondern Himmels-Zeichen, welches erstere sich bey der Haupt- und Seestadt Riga in Lifland zugetragen,' etc. Both of these books were, by a curious coincidence, printed by Anthony Armbruster, or Armbruester, who at one time was associated in the printing business with Benjamin Franklin—Mr. Evans says from 1754 to 1756, though both Thomas and Hildeburn say that their connection lasted till 1758.

The peculiarities of the Bankside Shakespere editing are too well known to call for comment at this date. The latest issue, volume xxi., "Love's Labour's Lost," gives the quarto of 1598 and the folio of 1623 verbatim. We detect a slip of the types: Quarto 370 and folio 393 both read: "It was fo sir," when the facsimiles read: "It was ſo sir" (long *s*). We can all admit cheerfully, however, that long *s* was an invention of the Evil One, a mild corrective of surquidry. The Introduction, by Dr. Isaac Hall Platt, touching upon the relation of the play to Shakspere, is readable and scholarly, and in the main sound. Nothing in it militates against the estimate expressed in our review of Furness's variorum edition of the play. At any rate, Dr. Platt wastes no time over the "Euphuism" of "Love's Labour's Lost," but tries to connect the play with personages and events of the late sixteenth century. His conjectures are worth pondering. The conclusion has a Baconian squint; that, however, was only to be expected, and need not trouble the orthodox.

From G. P. Putnam's Sons comes a book which, except for the imprint, would seem to be privately printed. It is entitled the 'Talbot J. Taylor Collection,' and is what a cataloguer would call a small folio, standing twelve inches high; thin, and numbering only 139 printed pages. It is devoted to giving illustrations of the collection named, with only 9 full-page pictures for the exterior of the house containing it and its grounds. The house shows as a country mansion of fair size, with that strongly English appearance which is got by the semblance of half-timbered construction, and by low walls, broad roofs, and a general overgrowth of vines. It is said to exist at Cedarhurst, L. I. The very brief text deals partly with the arrangement of articles in the house and partly with the objects themselves, namely, furniture, specimens of carved wood, and a few purely decorative objects, statuettes, and the like. The illustrations are entirely in half-tone, and include many valuable specimens worthy of the attention of any student.

Few of our readers, we trust, grumble at their school rates; but a good many suspect shrewdly that the returns are out of all proportion to the money paid in. For explanation of the discrepancy we would refer to a pamphlet: 'Warum kann die amerikanische Volksschule nicht leisten, was die deutsche leistet? Von einem alten Deutsch-Amerikaner.' The pamphlet is Heft 2, Band XV. of the "Sammlung pädagogischer Vorträge," published by Marowsky in Minden, and is to be had for the modest sum of 61 pfennigs. Truly *multum in parvo*. We cannot attempt to condense what is already a model of condensation, but will give one or two general points. The causes are arranged under two main heads: (I) those for which the school authorities are not responsible; (II) those which the school authorities might remove, if they would. Under the first heading are such factors as the mixed nature of the population by reason of immigration; the migratory habits of the American people in general; the composite nature of the English language. Among the more or less remediable evils are: waste of time upon fads; antediluvian methods; sentimentality due to excess of the *Ewig-weiblich;* inadequate training of the teacher. The writer lays down his points with precision and with arithmetical directness. He is no mere fault-finder, but a genuine American, by adoption if not by birth, and his controlling motive is rational patriotism.

"Wer Ist's?' for 1906 (Leipzig: Degener; New York: Lemcke & Buechner) contains the biographies of nearly 16,000 persons, chiefly Germans, but it also embraces prominent representatives of other nations. It has all the usefulness of dictionaries of its class. In addition to the biographies, there are valuable tables of statistics, showing the increase of population, the growth of cities, the development of industrialism and trade; the relative strength of armies and navies, including warships and merchantmen in different countries; the monetary systems of all nations compared with the present standard of coinage in the Ger-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man Empire; libraries, art galleries, museums, universities, and other institutions of learning and nurseries of culture in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland; and, finally, biographies of the rulers and chief executives in all lands, beginning with the Duchy of Anhalt and ending with the United States. There is also a list of about 3,000 pseudonyms of different authors, whose real names are given. We need say no more of this annual.

The thirteenth volume of Meyer's Konversations-Lexikon (Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut: New York: Lemcke & Buechner) extends from Lyrik to Mitterwurzer. Prominent articles are those on Meteorology, Mineralogy, Milk, Military (in divers attributions), Man, accompanied by proportionately measured-off types of the human figure from many races, Mimicry, with a colored plate illustrative of that in the insect world, Medals, with beautiful examples; Morocco especially; Mexico, with a map, and Painting. Among the maps of Madrid, Magdeburg, Milan, Mainz, Mannheim, Marseilles, etc., Metz excites attention with three (one for the battles round-about in 1870). So does the folding chart of the Mediterranean Sea and adjacent communicating seas; and further, the map of international fleet stations and defences in 1905. What might escape observation is, under *Masse*, a list of terms used in various countries for metric quantities (more differentiated than might have been expected, in adjusting them to the genius of each language), and of non-metric names in vogue before the new system prevailed. Significant is the article on the higher education for girls in Germany, which, in spite of a mediæval reference or two, really began in 1872. Equally commendable is the table, under Maritime Scientific Expeditions, by *ships* (but the greatest of all, the *Beagle*, is wanting). There is a poor, colorless notice of McKinley, with no reference to his part in forcing the Spanish war while pretending to stave it off and in retaining the Philippines, or to his bad faith in suffering the Dingley tariff to be raised after his reëlection on the money issue with the aid of tariff-reform Democrats. His part in engineering his own bill is much exaggerated.

An academic "Studienfahrt" to the classic sites of Italy and Greece, by students of the University of Berlin, will take place during the month of August. The excursion will cover a period of twenty-five days, during which visits will be made under competent direction to Genoa, Rome, Naples, Delphi, Athens, Corinth, Corfù, and Venice. While visiting the leading sites where archæological researches are being made in Greece, Professor Dörpfeld will act as guide and instructor. The number of participants will be large.

It has finally been decided to cease publishing the lecture announcements of the University of Berlin in Latin. All the faculties acted in the matter, and, after securing the consent of the Cultus Minister of Prussia, the Academic Senate resolved, that, beginning with the winter semester of 1906-7, the lecture list should appear only in German, and in three parts: one giving the subjects, the second the names of the docents, the third the hour. The programme will be edited by Prof. Dr. Palzkowski, manager of the Academic Bureau of Information (*Auskunftsstelle*). This puts an end to another specimen of the "Zopf" which the universities of the Fatherland have inherited from past generations.

—The fourth volume of Smyth's admirable edition of Franklin's Writings (Macmillan) covers six years, of which four were passed by Franklin in London. The reader cannot fail to be impressed by the absence of reports and memoranda to his official superiors during his first visit to England, when he was charged with matters of great importance to the Province, and given the use of no little money to effect the purpose of his mission. He expended the money and drew a liberal allowance for his own charges, and his bills were cheerfully paid by the Assembly in spite of some hints of extravagance and even of peculation. Yet nothing can be learned from Franklin's papers of the nature of these negotiations, and the records of the Province are quite as barren. His pamphlet on the 'Interest of Great Britain Considered,' his letters to his wife and Mary Stevenson, and an intention to compose an 'Art of Virtue' were the chief incidents of this stay in England. Strahan almost persuaded him to come into partnership with him, which would have made Franklin the King's Printer! Even his scientific experiments languished, and he rested upon what he had already accomplished. His second visit to England found him a fully developed politician, the agent of the revolt in Pennsylvania against the Proprietary Government, and an active participant in the discussions created by that "Mother of Mischief," the Stamp Act. With his pen he contributed to the newspapers, and his examination in the House of Commons has remained one of the best examples of his wisdom and shrewd foresight. He represented America, not merely Pennsylvania, while the greeting by Hume as the "first philosopher" coming from America marked the position he had attained outside of politics. While Mr. Smyth has not found much that was new in this period, his careful observance of textual accuracy much increases the value of what is printed. An occasional use of the long *s* is confusing, and the word *tous* for *tons* on p. 269 is clearly an error.

—Mr. William B. Weeden's 'War Government, Federal and State, in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Indiana, 1861-1865' (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.) is a laborious study of the "interplay of the National Union and the State Commonwealths which were principalities in the Civil War, especially in its early stages." A "salient point" in this study, according to the author, lies "in the contention that, if the powers of the people voluntarily thrust upon the Administration in the year following the autumn of 1861 had been energized and fully employed, the tremendous changes in the Constitution and Government of the United States would not have occurred." Incidentally, we have a narrative of the war, and discussions of the parts played in it by Lincoln, Stanton, "war governors" and "Copperheads," with sketches of Andrew, Morton, Horatio Seymour, and other leading men. It seems to us perfectly clear that Mr. Weeden has sustained his side of the "contention," if it be necessary to contend at all; because, if half the period of the war had not been taken up in "energizing and fully employing" the powers of the people, the war would have come to an end two years before it did, and hence possibly without either a draft or the abolition of slavery. But speculation of this kind leads to little or nothing. The body of the book is devoted to a narrative account of the "interplay" of Federal and State authority during the war, ending substantially in the temporary atrophy of the old State system. The narrative, well fortified by references, is marred by a good deal of feeble and confused rhetoric.

—Miss Jane Harrison's 'Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens' (1890) has been a useful companion of many students and travellers in Greece, as well as a teacher to many scholars in their libraries. But since the publication of that book much has been learned about early Athens, and, instead of making a vamped edition of the former work, Miss Harrison writes a new and briefer one, 'Primitive Athens' (Macmillan), in which she takes as her text the account given by Thucydides of the ancient city. The earlier book was valued particularly as embodying the latest views of Dr. Dörpfeld, who for a score of years has been the highest authority on Athenian topography, Greek architecture, and the art of archæological excavation. The new book also has had the advantage of his revision. To him it is dedicated, and Miss Harrison is most explicit in her expressions of acknowledgment to him. The favored scholars who not only have read the publications of the German Archæological Institute, but also have heard Dr. Dörpfeld lecture in the presence of the monuments, will recognize his influence on almost every page, and will be glad of this clear presentation of his views, while scholars who have not heard those lectures will welcome the book still more heartily. The main argument is for the location of the early agora, and in particular of the fountain Enneacrunus, in the valley between the Acropolis, the Pnyx, the Areopagus, and the hill of the Muses. That a narrow path led down from the Acropolis directly to the Enneacrunus, is one of the neatest of slight indications. The book discusses also the sanctuaries on the Acropolis in the seventh and sixth centuries B. C. The weight of evidence has been growing in favor of Dörpfeld's views, although these assume the careless formation of a Thucydidean sentence; and many readers, as they lay down the book, will echo the author's hope that the Enneacrunus episode "may be laid to sleep in peace," though we fear that she depreciates the firmness of the opponents of Dr. Dörpfeld's theories.

—In her mythological excursions, Miss Harrison is less likely to secure the ready adherence of her readers, though it was her interest in mythology which first drew her to the study of topography. The principles of the science of mythology are not firmly founded as yet, and many of its theories are tentative. A conservative philologist, for example, would think that Miss Harrison goes beyond her evidence when she argues that Heracles was a foreigner to Greece, an Oriental, from the fact that he presided over the gymnasium of Cynosarges, outside the gates of Athens, which was frequented by youths like Themistocles

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who had foreign blood in their veins; that "Aphrodite came to the Greeks from the East, and, like most Semitic divinities, she was not only a duality, but a trinity"; that "Deucalion is a figure manifestly Oriental, a feeble copy of the archetypal Noah"; and that "the worship of Poseidon and Athena came from Libya to Attica from a people geographically remote, but with racial affinities." More convincing and interesting are the arguments to prove the later arrival at Athens of Zeus and Apollo from the fact that neither has any sanctuary on the Acropolis, although both seem to have had shrines assigned to them just outside the old Pelasgic wall. A good bibliography adds to the value of the book.

—'History in Scott's Novels,' by the Hon. A. S. G. Canning (Wessels), is a book which bears an attractive title and is not without some merit. At the same time we have been impressed by a sense that a different type of essay upon the same subject might be made more successful. Mr. Canning takes up fifteen novels in chronological sequence, from 'The Talisman' to 'Redgauntlet,' and runs through such portions of the plot as bring authentic personages into view. His main object apparently is to substantiate the dictum of Macaulay which he selects as the motto of the volume: "Sir Walter Scott has used those fragments of truth which historians have scornfully thrown behind them in a manner which may well excite their envy. He has constructed out of their gleanings works which, even considered as histories, are scarcely less valuable than theirs." Keeping this statement ever in mind, Mr. Canning loses no opportunity to show that Scott is *verbatim et literatim* an exponent of historical truth. When, in 'Ivanhoe,' John proposes that Rebecca be made Queen of Beauty, the comment runs: "This invented scene likely indicates historic truth to some extent, alike showing the unscrupulous nature of John, the helpless state of the English Jews, and the absurd prejudices of Saxons and Normans against them at this excited period of English history." The quality of Scott's genius as an interpreter of former ages and striking types of civilization is less emphasized by far than is his technical accuracy. Mr. Canning himself is not very accurate, and when he tells us that Richard, on his return from the Crusade, was imprisoned by "the Austrian Emperor," he indicates pretty clearly that in some ingenious fashion he has managed to dodge the Hohenstaufen. Some fault may also be found with the style, as illustrated by such a sentence as this: "The singular introduction of the White Lady of Avenel, a fairy adherent or relative of the heroine, Mary Avenel's family, though a pleasing idea, of course adds little if anything to the historic truths or value of this story, which leaves Scotland partly yielding to the Reformed doctrines, Mary Queen of Scots being powerless and, owing to her religion, unpopular, while Murray and Morton, the two Scottish rulers at this time, are allied with England, their country's former historic rival if not foe." A wasted opportunity will be found in what Mr. Canning does *not* say about Charles the Bold in his chapter on 'Anne of Geierstein.' The concluding sentence of the same chapter will likewise help to explain why we cannot speak of this book with any great enthusiasm: "Charles of Burgundy, perhaps the chief historical personage in 'Anne of Geierstein,' may not have been described in a play, or if he has, was not so popular a subject of dramatic attention as his astute rival and nominal Sovereign, Louis the Eleventh, who certainly never seems to have had much authority over so imperious a vassal as Charles the Bold."

—Two articles by M. Eugène d'Eichthal, which appeared originally in Paris periodicals, have just been issued in pamphlet form. The first is a friendly estimate of the late Émile Boutmy, and the second is entitled 'Quelques Notes d'un Voyage aux États-Unis,' based on the author's observations as a delegate to the international railway congress held at Washington in May of last year. M. d'Eichthal, who is a member of the Institute and the son of M. Gustave d'Eichthal, one of the most distinguished of the early Saint-Simonians, is a warm admirer of M. Boutmy, so well known for his studies of the constitution or rather political history of the United States and England. M. d'Eichthal continues: "I have heard the historians of those two countries praise the intelligent grasp which M. Boutmy showed of the fundamental causes, whence, by following different currents, springs the political and social evolution of Great Britain and America. He was neither abstract like Tocqueville, nor did he go into almost excessive detail like Bryce, nor was he oversystematic like so many commentators of English institutions. Perceiving and understanding with precision the real facts, he would pass on them a broad and exact judgment." M. d'Eichthal's account of what he saw, heard, and thinks of the United States is less sympathetic than this study of the scholarly founder of the excellent school in the Rue St. Guillaume, but, on the whole, he is as fair as could be expected under the circumstances. What he says of New York and Chicago seems to be the prevailing note of this *carnet de voyage:* "The two cities give an impression which I have never felt so deeply elsewhere—that of the disproportion of the scale of the physical man to that of the works which spring from him." Of all our public buildings which he visited, only one appears to win his entire praise, and even of this nothing is said of the exterior: "The Library of Congress is, inside, one of the finest and best arranged edifices I ever saw." M. d'Eichthal is a director in one of the great French railway companies, and his pamphlet contains several valuable reflections concerning some of our trunk lines. Touching on a subject which has recently been examined in the *Nation*, he expresses astonishment at the light way in which the American public treats railway accidents, some of which, if they happened in France, "would cause the fall of the Cabinet." The machinery of the Chicago stockyards impressed him, but the unpleasantness of the operations seemed only that inseparable from such bloody business.

—Lillian Dalbiac's 'Dictionary of Quotations (German)'—London: Sonnenschein; New York: Macmillan—raises the old question how far we have to deal in such a work with a simple anthology directed by the personal equation, or a real body of "familiar quotations" gleaned from what is taught in the schools, heard daily from the lips in conversation, or found in a reasonable range of standard literary expression. To take a concrete example, are these sentimental lines from Chamisso "familiar" (p. 126):

> "Du schaust mich an und lächelst dazu,
> Du lieber, lieber Engel du"—

or did the compiler, in making up her Chamisso posey, fail to pluck such nervous and ringing lines as these from his poem entitled "Schiller"?

> "Denn Gottes Rathschluss wird dennoch bestehen.
> Die Frucht der Zeit zu ihrer Zeit geboren,
> Und das, was an der Zeit ist, doch geschehen."

This premised, we pronounce the present collection a useful one. It would have gained by not splitting up poems, like Luther's "Ein feste Burg," for the parts most in favor. Mr. Bartlett's practice is in this respect more commendable. We are not sure, too, that anything would have been lost by omitting the metrical translations sedulously gathered or procured; and certainly where they were not already found in reputable English poetic sources, it would have been better to stick to prose versions. Examples of sad failure are numerous, but we will not cite them. Goethe naturally leads, with "Faust" at the fore, followed by his "Tasso" and "Iphigenie." Schiller is nearly as fully drawn upon (our comparison is indexical)—"Don Carlos" first, "Wallenstein's Tod," "Wilhelm Tell." Heine and Bodenstedt, Lessing, Rückert, Körner, Platen (who forced Carducci into the ranks of the translators), Richter, Geibel—so the line tapers off. In the prose extracts Bismarck is preëminent; even Luther's supply is scanty. There are subject and author indexes, showing occasionally faulty references.

—In 1904 Prof. Georg Jacob of Erlangen began to publish translations of popular Turkish texts, such as *Märchen*, current in Constantinople. Five parts of from 60 to 130 pages have so far appeared, and the collection, under the title of "Türkische Bibliothek," promises to be one of the first interest and value for modern Turkish city life and its ideas, manners, and ways. Part I., besides a valuable introduction on the art of the public story-teller in the East, gives a number of such tales, showing folk-lore origin, but very strongly flavored, too, with broad modern humor. The three parts which follow next contain translations by Dr. Theodor Menzel of Odessa from Mehmed Tevfiq's unfortunately uncompleted 'Year in Constantinople.' The author of that work, an Old Turk of Bohemian life but astounding knowledge of old-fashioned Constantinople and its ways, who died about 1897-8, intended to make it a picture of the modes of entertainment current round the year among the Turks of Constantinople who had remained unaffected by the West. He saw the coming of a new time, and sought to fix the old life as he had known and lived it in his younger years. In this way, though an uncontaminated Oriental, he was really a folklorist, and recognized how quickly popular games, usages, and amusements vanish from the memories of the later generations. Unfortunately, only five *months* appeared, three of which are translated here. Either the author's endurance failed, or the Government, for some mys-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terious reason, interfered. The present translations are not exactly easy reading; they are intended for those already interested in Turkish literature and having some knowledge of Turkish. But if they cannot be read on the run by any one, they will still be quite intelligible to the folklorist, who should greet this genuine comrade and faithful worker, though he probably never heard the word *folklore*. The fifth part is a translation by Professor Jacob himself of the Turkish *Märchen* and story-book 'Xoros Kardash,' 'Brother Cock,' with a storyological introduction prefixed. He has also just published a third, revised edition of his bibliography of shadow-figures, 'Erwähnungen des Schatten-Theaters in der Welt-Litteratur.' All these with Mayer & Müller, Berlin.

MODERN GERMANY.

Modern Germany: Her Political and Economic Problems. By O. Eltzbacher. London: Smith, Elder & Co.; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1905. Pp. 346.

If any one of King Edward's subjects thinks everything is going wrong in Britain, he will find society in his disgruntled mood in this handsomely printed volume, parts of the contents of which have already appeared in various periodical reviews. The author, apparently an Englishman of German extraction, essays to bring to the consciousness of his insular countrymen some homely truths regarding the way in which their Teutonic neighbors threaten to forge ahead of them, unseat them in their fancied eternal preëminence in the world's commerce, and finally crush them if they remain deaf and blind to the warnings of the times. These lessons he drives home in a sledge-hammer fashion calculated to make the poor Briton tremble for his safety. In his introduction, Mr. Eltzbacher in ringing terms contrasts the splendid results achieved by paternalism and fostering governmental activity in Germany—the subordination of the individual to the State—with what he considers the meagre output of the *laissez-faire* policy and the assertion of individualism as against administrativism in Great Britain:

"If Germany had followed the policy of *laissez-faire*," says the author, "if the German Government had been subordinated to the 'will of the people,' and if it had always waited for the lead of 'The Man in the Street,' the German nation would still be a medley of peasants, university professors, philosophers, and soldiers."

And a little further on he remarks:

"Class government has proved a failure in England, and party government, as at present carried on, is proving a failure, because the enormous forces of opposition and of obstruction act as an effective check to rapid and even to adequate political and economic progress."

Having delivered himself of his overture, Mr. Eltzbacher launches forth upon a detailed exposition, braced by copious statistics, of the "expansion of Germany." The German Empire contains 60,000,000 inhabitants. Its population has increased by one-half since the war of 1870; the rate of increase is an accelerated one; and, according to the prediction of Hübbe-Schleiden, the babes of 1906 will live to be part of a nation of 150,000,000 souls crowded within the borders of the old Fatherland. While the German people at home is thus growing at a tremendous pace, Germany abroad, Mr. Eltzbacher tries to prove, tends to disappear. According to him, the German cut loose from his moorings is unable to resist absorption by his neighbors. The Germans of Cisleithan Austria, he thinks, are bound to be absorbed very soon by the rising tide of Slavdom about them, and those of Hungary to disappear by Magyarization. In the United States and other parts of the American continent the process of denationalization will ever proceed rapidly. "This spectacle fills many thoughtful Germans with regret and sadness," and with a feeling akin to uneasiness, as our author observes in another place. "Germany is loath to strengthen foreign nations, her present and future competitors, with her emigration, which earlier of later must set in in a powerful stream." Therefore Germany must see to it that she has possessions somewhere beyond the seas into which this great stream may be made to run. "The existing German colonies do not offer an outlet for the emigration of white men. Consequently the resolution has arisen to acquire colonies in a temperate zone whenever and wherever possible." England and the United States stand in the way of Germany's ambition to become a "world Power," and Mr. Eltzbacher sees her preparing for the inevitable conflict, which is to be a death-struggle, with the Anglo-Saxon race. He warns Englishmen that it is high time to rouse themselves to this fact. "Present-day Germany owes her greatness to the sword," and it is with the sword, or rather with an invincible fleet of battle-ships, that she intends to conquer colonies. An interesting array of quotations is presented from the newspaper press and the utterances of distinguished professors to show how intent the Germans are on becoming a world Power at the expense of the Anglo-Saxons, and how dominant is the conviction of the necessity of a great navy.

The author considers it "sufficiently clear that Germany's new fleet has been created for the purpose of fighting Great Britain and the United States, or both nations, in the pursuit of colonies and of commerce." Mr. Eltzbacher has full faith in the ability of Germany to carry out her programme, and he believes further that an alliance between the Empire and France is decidedly in the air. That Germany possesses the means to create as powerful a navy as she chooses, no one will question. So many millions, so many battleships; and world commerce, not to speak of world empire, is worth the investment. But why suppose for a moment that England will stand by and not manage to keep well ahead in the race? Can she not quicken her pace as well as Germany? And, granting that the ultimate potential resources of the one Power are as great as those of the other, will not that one whose very existence depends upon her undisputed maritime predominance forever stretch the limits of exertion and sacrifice far beyond anything that the thirst for expansion can impel the other to strain up to? Germany may as well settle down to the fact that the position of Britain is well nigh impregnable from the sheer force of circumstances. As for an alliance between France and Germany against Great Britain, it is hard to imagine what inducements could tempt the French to take the chances of a defeat at the hands of the British. At first sight, indeed, England would appear to be in a position to outbid Germany altogether in the offer for such an alliance. She has only to say the word, and France can become a great colonial Power, and that without prejudice to British interests. There is Morocco, together with Tripoli, and there are the German possessions in Africa and much besides on that continent, and England could safely allow the extension of French dominion over the whole of Siam, an enlarged French Indo-China being no disadvantage to England in the event of aggressions from a resurrected China. Still, all such visions of territorial expansion are offset by the necessity for France to remain on friendly terms with Germany. The truth is, although she may be loath to admit it, the future of France lies in keeping hands off either Power. It is becoming more and more likely, as years go by, that far-seeing French statesmen, having awakened to the fact that before long, at the present rate of increase, the population of Germany will be twice that of nearly stationary France, and perhaps in the not distant future three times as great, will become convinced that the salvation of France lies in making peace once for all with her neighbor beyond the Vosges, whose military power threatens soon to become invincible. It will yet take time, however, for French patriots who are still dreaming of *revanche* to accommodate themselves to this view. In the meanwhile the one way for Germany to win over France is to offer to restore Alsace-Lorraine, but to this we cannot expect Germans ever to make up their minds.

Mr. Eltzbacher devotes a chapter to the "Expansion of Germany, and the Russian Problem." He is persuaded that the struggle between Slav and Teuton will soon have to be fought out. It will be with Constantinople as her base that Russia will get at her foe, first bursting the Austro-Hungarian realm asunder through her hold upon the Slavic peoples. The author advises Great Britain to watch the coming conflict "with the equanimity of a disinterested spectator. It would be the height of folly if she should unnecessarily join the fray."

The first half of the book before us contains, in addition to the matters which we have been discussing, interesting chapters on the German Emperor, the Armed Forces of Germany, and the Social Democratic Party. The second half is devoted to a consideration of rural industries, means of transportation, the wonderfully developed chemical industries, and the fiscal policy of Germany. There is much here for the Englishman, with his insular horizon, to ponder. In a series of chapters bristling with statistics, Mr. Eltzbacher endeavors to set forth the benefits that have flowed in Germany from the governmental policy of looking out for the economic interests of the people, as embodied in protection, state ownership of railways, the extension of water communications, and the provision of technical education; at the same time he holds up to the English, as a result of their *laissez-faire* policy, the spectacle of their decadent agriculture, the abuses to which they are subjected through the private ownership of railways, the hopeless condition of their artificial waterways, and the evils resulting from the lack of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

industrial training. Unless England chooses to profit by the experience of her neighbor, he predicts that she will soon drop behind Germany in the industrial race.

Mr. Eltzbacher, throughout his book, speaks with an air of authority, and with a reiteration that becomes wearisome. His speculations and asseverations would, however, bear more weight if he were less prone to trace results to their causes along the lines that suit his thesis, and if he had less of a slap-dash way of drawing inferences from statistics. It is preposterous, for example, to conclude from the figures of the Austrian census that "the German element in Austria seems likely to disappear almost completely within a few decades." The figures given at page 16 show a barely perceptible decrease in the percentage of Germans in Cisleithania between the years 1890 and 1900 (36.04 and 35.78). But Mr. Eltzbacher would see in this "only the beginning of an enormous shrinkage which has commenced to set in." In making up his inventory of the population of Greater Germany, he estimates the German element in the United States at 11,000,000 souls! When he affirms (p. 43) that between 1857 and 1876 no less than 4,606,000 Germans emigrated to Russia, while only 4,048,000 returned to Germany, he is basing his reckoning on quicksands. What is the use of reminding Englishmen that their birthrate is rapidly falling, and is almost the lowest in Europe, when the population of England and Wales has increased in the last quarter of a century from 26,000,000 to more than 34,000,000? As a matter of fact, owing to improved sanitary conditions, the excess of births over deaths in England has continued to increase steadily in the last decade. If agriculture is sadly declining in England, while it is advancing in Germany, are we bound to agree with Mr. Eltzbacher that it is because everything is wrong in England and the other way in Germany? Granting that extortionate railway tariffs and discriminations prevail in the one, and a well-ordered railway service and cheap water transportation (not to speak of protective duties) in the other, is there nothing else that might tend to make a fundamental difference between the two countries? May not the backward-tending course of agriculture in England, as compared with Germany, be largely the expression of the fact that manufactures and commerce offer a relatively more remunerative field for labor and capital in the one country than in the other? England has not been transformed from an agricultural to an industrial country because agriculture ceased to pay, but because manufacturing paid better, and because the great sources of food supply beyond the seas were brought within easy reach. It may be true, indeed, that agricultural prosperity in Germany has gone hand in hand with an extraordinary development of manufacturing industries, but we must bear in mind that there was room for such an industrial development to take place without any very great disturbance of the rural population. The author himself admits that there has been much more room for agricultural progress in Germany than in England. His own tables, it appears to us, do not altogether bear out his roseate view of this improvement. The statistics of live stock in Germany between 1873 and 1900 (p. 183) indicate on the whole a great diminution per capita of the population. The absolute increase, in itself not large, is not at all to the point. Mr. Eltzbacher contrasts the vast activity expended in Germany on the improvement of waterways, and the resulting low cost of transportation, with the apathy exhibited in Great Britain with regard to rivers and canals. His figures are certainly striking, but he attributes too much importance to the facts brought out in his comparison, overlooking the great difference in underlying conditions in the two countries. Germany is a country of large rivers and great distances. England is relatively a small country, and there is hardly a place in it that is more than sixty miles from the sea. It is natural that railways there should monopolize so much of the traffic. The comparatively short hauls by water, given the artificial channels, would hardly result in such a gain as our author would have us believe.

ATLAY'S VICTORIAN CHANCELLORS.

The Victorian Chancellors. By J. B. Atlay. In two volumes. Vol. I.: Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Brougham, Lord Cottenham, Lord Truro. London: Smith, Elder & Co.; Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1906.

Mr. Atlay's 'Victorian Chancellors' commences a set of judicial biographies which are full of interest. He cannot, it is true, paint effectively an historical portrait; he does not possess the marvellous insight and the equally marvellous power of expression which enables Bagehot, in a few epigrammatic words, to discover to us the very essence of the character of men so remarkable as Brougham and Lyndhurst. Still, Mr. Atlay, though neither a subtle thinker nor a masterly writer, does provide his readers with a clear, sensible, and, above all, an honest narrative of the career of the men whose lives he undertakes to write. A natural reaction, it is true, against the slanderous malignity of a notorious biographer who could never forgive the contempt for "plain John Campbell" felt and expressed by two men of genius immeasurably his superiors, has led Mr. Atlay to assume in the case of Lyndhurst and Brougham, and especially of Lyndhurst, too much the attitude of an apologist, and to attempt the dreary and thankless task of defending the indefensible. His work, however, is well done. It corrects misrepresentations to which the dignity of a chancellor who pretended to be an historian has given undue weight. Nor can any one regret that the noblest characteristics of public men such as Brougham (who, by the way, has technically no right to be included among "Victorian" Chancellors) and of Lyndhurst, who, whatever his faults, will always remain one of the glories of the English judicial system, should be forced upon the attention of readers who have nearly forgotten the last among English chancellors who could claim to be not only lawyers but statesmen.

The short biographies of Cottenham and Truro are not unworthy either of praise or of notice. Each of these men rose to deserved eminence by pure legal ability. In Lord Cottenham we have a chancellor who, by his unrivalled insight into legal principle, was the creator of law; in Lord Truro we have the rare instance of a man who retained throughout life the spirit of an industrious and acute attorney, yet with universal approval became the occupant of the woolsack. It is amusing to think that one who filled the highest position attainable by any British subject should have been so fond of and immersed in the technicalities of the law that, to use the happy words of Mr. Atlay, "We can almost hear him ejaculating with Uriah Heep, 'Oh, what a writer Mr. Tidd is, Master Copperfield!' " But every intelligent reader of the 'Victorian Chancellors' will assuredly turn away from the merely legal eminence of Cottenham and Truro, and occupy himself with Lyndhurst and Brougham, who are the two heroes of Mr. Atlay's first volume.

Though no two chancellors were more unlike one another, they displayed throughout their careers several common characteristics. They both were statesmen; they both were party leaders; they both, at a revolutionary crisis, commanded the admiration of thousands among their countrymen; they both were endowed with talents so extraordinary as to rise to genius; they both forced themselves to eminence without the aid of patronage, by simple force of character and intellectual capacity; they both belonged in spirit to an age of a lower moral tone than that of the generation of which they were the leaders. The career of each suggests the same problem: Why do the lives of men distinguished beyond all their fellows leave on the mind of every candid critic a sense of failure? Why did the intellectual triumphs of Lyndhurst miss their mark? why did the brilliancy of Brougham's victory over adverse circumstances which made him for a moment the most powerful and the most popular statesman in England, suffer sudden and final eclipse? The question is a curious one, but may easily be answered by any student who weighs the facts collected together by Mr. Atlay, and also recognizes what Mr. Atlay, with a singular want of acumen, fails to do, the decisiveness and the finality of the judgments pronounced by Walter Bagehot. Lyndhurst's career was in one sense, indeed, a perpetual success. His commanding intellect and his social charm secured for him an admiration and an affection which ceased only with his life. To his mental power a tribute has been paid by his severest censor, which makes any other appreciation feeble and useless. It should be read as a whole, though space allows us here to quote but a few words from Bagehot's discriminating eulogy:

"There was no laxity in his intellect; everything there was braced and knit. . . . Few will recur to Lord Lyndhurst's speeches, but those who do so will find some of the best, if not the very best, specimens in English of the best manner in which a man of great intellect can address and influence the intellects of others. . . . The words seem the simplest, clearest, and most natural that a man could use. It is only the instructed man who knows that he could not himself have used them, and that few men could."

His eminence among lawyers was uncontested. There have been chancellors who have possessed a more profound and complete knowledge of the law of England, but

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no man has ever brought to the discharge of judicial functions a more powerful mind, or more absolute intellectual impartiality than did Lyndhurst. Every one who came before him knew that he was in the presence of a great judge. The charm, further, and the urbanity of one of Nature's noblemen told upon every man who enjoyed his society. Lyndhurst was not exactly made for a popular hero; but when he reached old age and denounced the tyranny of Russia, or, after his eyesight had failed him, displayed from memory a mass of legal erudition that was, after all, simply the illustration of the powerful argument which (much to the detriment of the nation) prevented the creation of peers for life, not only the legal profession, but all the educated part of the English people, felt proud of the old man who, when well past eighty years of age, still proved himself a consummate legist, advocate, and orator. Yet, for all this, in Lyndhurst's career there was something lacking. He had the gifts of statesmanship, but he never was in reality the leader of the nation. In spite of his intellectual detachment he played the part without sharing the prejudices of a partisan; and even as a party man he excited distrust. He was generally believed to have been a political renegade.

Mr. Atlay tries to prove that the belief was unfounded. The full evidence for it is not now forthcoming, but Lyndhurst's apologist seems not to perceive how the case really stands. An accuser may not be able to prove that Lyndhurst ever formally deserted deliberately entertained political principles; so be it. The true accusation is, that Lyndhurst never in strictness entertained any political principles whatever. That in early life he entertained democratic sympathies, is in the highest degree probable. What is certain is, that Lyndhurst looked upon politics as a game, and took office under the Tory Government of Lord Liverpool when to join the Tories seemed the only mode of achieving political success. He was not, probably, more unprincipled than many politicians of his youth; he shared the low political morality which belonged to an age that was passing away. In the days of Peel, of Lord John Russell, and of Althorpe he was influenced by the ideas which belonged to the days of Bute and of Wedderburn. High intellectual power, moreover, justly exposes its possessor to be judged by a high moral standard. A man who ought to have been the foremost statesman of his day could not without disgrace adopt the moral tone which might not be unbecoming in Rigby or in Creevy.

How little, after all, Lyndhurst could be trusted, may be inferred from the fact that Mr. Atlay himself does not appear fully to believe the word of his hero, even on an occasion when Lyndhurst must be taken to pledge his word as a man of honor. "He played the game of life," writes Bagehot, "for low and selfish objects; and yet, by the intellectual power with which he played it, he redeemed that game from its intrinsic degradation." And this terrible sentence is too lenient. The playing of the political game for low and selfish objects—the treatment, indeed, of politics as a game at all—has been, and always will be, the bane of public life in England; and the wretched game is none the less degrading because the public learn to admire the skill of a player endowed with consummate ability.

Brougham had none of the fineness of Lyndhurst's intellect. He was deficient, one would have supposed, in everything which could be called charm, though, according to Sir James Mackintosh, his "address and insinuation" were so great that nothing but the bad temper which he could not conceal, could hinder him from mastering everybody with whom he came in contact. He conquered the House of Commons, though the members hated while they feared him. The old judge, in truth, who used to style Brougham, when summing up against him, "the Harangue," in an odd way hit the mark. Brougham seemed at times rather a force than a human being. Neither individuals nor the crowd could be insensible to what Bagehot describes as "such an aggressive intellect—so much *knocking* mind." From 1818 to 1832 he became, in the eyes of the English people, the incarnation of power. He was, as Mr. Atlay well points out, at his very best during the Queen's trial; he fought for his client tooth and nail; he crushed hostile witnesses; he bore down opposition; he bullied the House of Lords; he made George shake with fear. The terrible advocate was prepared, if every other resource failed, to show the whole nation the baseness of a royal voluptuary. Brougham was the man to risk revolution rather than lose his cause. Happily for himself, he was retained on the right side. The Queen, whatever her faults, was the victim of gross injustice. The English public sympathized with a woman whom they knew to be wronged. Yet her triumph, such as it was, could hardly have been secured by any man who had not possessed the superhuman energy of Brougham. This success established his power. In 1830 he was for a moment master of the situation.

Of his blunder in accepting the chancellorship, of the still grosser blunder which prevented his ever again being chancellor, the circumstances are known, and they are amply stated, though too favorably for Brougham, in Mr. Atlay's pages. The question before us is not why Brougham blundered, but why were Brougham's errors fatal to his career? Whoever considers this problem must remember that Brougham, whatever his faults, was, by the admission of his opponents, endowed with a genuine public spirit, shown, for example, in his life-long zeal for the promotion of education. He was, moreover, at the height of his power, what Lyndhurst never became, a genuine popular hero; he wielded an influence—for a short time only, it is true—which may well be compared to that of Gladstone in 1880. Yet, for all this, he fell suddenly, and fell to rise no more. Nor are the causes of this calamity in reality hard to find. Brougham's genius itself was closely connected with a certain want of sanity which, combined with the habits of his life, made hostile contemporaries suspect that, on one or two celebrated occasions, he spoke or acted under the influence of drink. He certainly exhibited at several crises of his career a kind of untrustworthiness and even cunning absolutely inconsistent with the possession of a sound judgment. With Brougham no colleague could feel safe. It is pretty clear that he sacrificed the interests of the Queen to the opportunity of display as her advocate, or to the chance of gaining a party triumph for the Whigs. No one trusted him. Those who knew him best trusted him least. Mr. Atlay, with more boldness than discretion, blames Melbourne for excluding Brougham from office. Melbourne was no purist; he was a clever man of the world who knew his own business much better than does Melbourne's critic. He felt, as a man of sense, that Brougham was less dangerous as an open enemy than as a faithless colleague.

Still, the completeness of Brougham's fall, arising as it did, in the main, from the defects of his character, was due also to external circumstances. He had the genius of a revolutionist. From 1815 to 1834, England was passing through a revolutionary crisis. For this stormy end Brougham was better suited than any other Englishman. It suited his vehement, stormy nature. But observers who thought that the passing of the Reform bill was only the first act of a sanguinary drama like that which, not fifty years before, had led to the destruction of the French monarchy, misunderstood the social condition of England and misread the signs of the time. By 1834 the political tempest had abated. What England required was an administration of genius, and the country found what it needed, not in Brougham, but in Peel. It was neither the wisdom nor the caprice of Lord Melbourne, but far rather the natural course of events, which closed Brougham's career. Fortune, too, which was kind to Brougham in his youth, was cruel to him in the later part of his life. He lived too long, and he had not the qualities which gave dignity and grace to the old age of Lyndhurst. There is something, indeed, pathetic in the affection of the two old men for one another; one likes to know that the death of Lyndhurst was a blow from which his former opponent never quite recovered. But Lyndhurst in his last years was far more fortunate than his friend. Brougham was in 1868, in the eyes of J. D. Coleridge, nothing more than "poor old Brougham"; he had survived his powers, he had almost survived his fame. Lyndhurst, on the other hand, retained his intellect and his literary and scientific tastes to the last. Men had forgotten his faults, and still admired his gifts and his grace. He died in the ninety-second year of his age. His last words, uttered in answer to some tender inquiry, were, "Happy? Yes, supremely happy."

ROSE'S DEVELOPMENT OF THE EUROPEAN NATIONS.

The Development of the European Nations, 1870-1900. By J. Holland Rose. 2 vols. Putnams.

This is a useful work, that aims to describe the steps by which the world to-day has arisen out of the conditions which prevailed fifty years ago. By the rapid summary which it supplies, we measure the completeness of the change which a single generation has witnessed. Although Mr. Rose is concerned chiefly with political and diplomatic transactions, the social states from which they spring are easily inferred, and when a war comes, he gives in great detail, with the zest of a military critic, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

progress of the campaign and the story of important battles. We miss, at times, a clear statement of the aims or ideals by which the actors in the drama were moved. Perhaps it is too soon to define the principles which have guided European evolution since 1870; and yet an attempt at such a definition ought to be made. Occasionally, through brief hints, Mr. Rose lets us infer that he has grasped the new synthesis; and then he tantalizes us by plunging again into a mass of details which seem as purposeless as a choppy sea. Nevertheless, some elements of this new synthesis are plain.

Liberty and nationality, the twin ideals which inspired the generation from 1830 to 1870, seem for the moment as obsolete as the rights of man. In 1860, Cavour and Garibaldi incarnated those principles; in 1900 England was struggling to stamp them out in South Africa, the United States in the Philippines, Russia in Finland. In 1860, the world looked with immense hope to the remedial effect of political reforms; it believed that constitutional government, the extension of the franchise, popular education, could be counted on to lift mankind rapidly towards perfection. But after 1870 reaction set in. Those panaceas began to be distrusted, for they failed to produce the desired results as quickly as had been promised; and, after all, they seemed to stop at the political and commercial, which are of the surface, whereas men were already in the toils of the industrial and the social, which are as deep as life itself.

The past thirty years have witnessed the radical changes due to the application of inventions to industry and agriculture. The telegraph, railways, and steamships make all men neighbors. Population has increased at a portentous rate—a fact which lies behind the land hunger and colonial enterprises which have determined most of the recent political action in Europe. Indeed, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that Imperialism, if we use the word in its widest sense, has been the vital characteristic of the period which Mr. Rose reviews. Liberty and nationality led directly to a united Germany and a united Italy, and to the establishment of a certain political equilibrium. Imperialism has transferred to other continents the jealousies and competitions which would earlier have been concentrated in the home nations. Hence it would appear that, while the tendency in Europe itself has been to create combinations which render war improbable, the imperial movement into which England, Russia, Germany, France, and even Italy have been swept, has set up conditions which greatly increase the probability of war. The world has at last become *solidaire*: so that a clash between outposts in the remotest part of Africa or Asia may threaten the peace of Europe.

Mr. Rose begins his work with the unification of Italy and of Germany, giving incidentally a rather minute account of the Franco-Prussian war. He then proceeds to describe the organization of the German Empire and the terrible straits out of which the French Republic emerged with a fighting chance for life. His picture of Thiers is one of the best in the book. The rest of his first volume is taken up with the Balkans, the Eastern Question, and the Russo-Turkish war. Southeastern Europe is, of course, the unfinished part of Europe, and will be as long as the Sultan remains at Constantinople; but since 1870 the process of organizing it has gone on almost without interruption, till to-day Bulgaria and Rumania have an independent existence; so virtually has Herzegovina; Servia looks to Austria and not to the Porte for instructions; Macedonia, though still under the Turk, has grown so restless that its release cannot be long delayed. In a word, the Balkan Peninsula has advanced far towards emancipating itself from the Turk, without becoming a mere Russian dependency, as political prophets until recently predicted it would become.

Mr. Rose devotes much space to these affairs, and he is justified, because it is hard to get a good account of them in English: we regret that at times his own account lacks clearness. It would have helped the general reader to lay more stress on the epochal fact that the Congress of Berlin, in turning Russia away from Constantinople, not only gave a great momentum to the Russianizing of northern and central Asia, but also permitted the reorganization of the Balkan States along non-Russian lines. His chapter on Nihilism and Absolutism in Russia contains much admirable information, but—as if to warn historians against prophesying—the events of the past year have contradicted some of his conclusions. The great strike used as a political weapon last autumn revealed unsuspected qualities in the Russian lower classes.

The only strictly European subject discussed in the second volume is the forming of the Triple and Dual Alliances, and here Mr. Rose is at his best. Then he goes on to narrate the complicated Central Asian and Afghan matters, which drew Russia and England into perilous neighborhood, and have left them in a position where the English, at least, believe war must come, sooner or later. England's control of Egypt, Gordon's quixotic heroism at Khartum, and the reconquest of the Sudan, are three parts of a continued story—a story which for mere strangeness has had few equals in modern days. The partition of Africa and the horrible record of the Congo Free State conclude the account of that continent; for Mr. Rose does not take up the Boer war, which disclosed the amazing incapacity of the English either to fight with white enemies on anything like equal terms, or to make use of modern military tactics and methods. A final chapter, on Russia in the Far East, brings the Russian and the Japanese face to face on the Pacific; but Mr. Rose refrains from entering upon the war itself.

Among many considerations which his survey suggests, we may mention these. First, since 1870, Germany has set up the standard which Europe has, willingly or not, followed, and that standard has been reactionary. Secondly, England, in spite of astonishing incapacity in foreign affairs—there never was a crazier commission, for instance, than that given to Gordon—has got the lion's share in continent carving. Next, the hope cherished in the last generation that democracies would not tolerate war has not been fulfilled, although it may justly be urged that the European governments are not yet true democracies. Fourthly, from 1870 to 1890 Bismarck's influence was paramount. Fifthly, since Bismarck, there has been no statesman of even second rank in Europe: Salisbury's ursine qualities had nothing of greatness about them, and the calamity of the Boer war already hangs like a millstone round his reputation; the German Kaiser plays for limelight effects, but it would be easy to show that the vital progress of Germany during the past fifteen years is due to the momentum which Bismarck created and directed. Finally, this period has lacked ideals. Egotism and Machiavellianism have had a free rein. The white man has assumed his right to kill or exploit black men, brown men, and yellow men, without pretending that in doing so he is obeying Christian precepts. The disintegration of what once passed for Christianity explains much of the white man's action during the past generation. Having learned from science the shibboleth, "survival of the fittest," he brands as "unfit" people inferior to himself in brute force, and proceeds to exterminate them. His favorite philospher is Nietzsche: his pet poet, Kipling of the bloody ballads; his hero, Cecil Rhodes, the glorified land and mine jobber.

Mr. Rose is somewhat uneven in style, perhaps because a large part of the sources of his work comes from newspapers and magazines. He has not put his material together with as much skill as Fyffe displayed in his 'Modern Europe,' and yet the period he deals with is so important and so interesting, and reliable works upon it are so few, that his volumes deserve a warm welcome.

Joseph Jefferson: Reminiscences of a Fellow-Player. By Francis Wilson. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1906.

Mr. Wilson's desire to bear public testimony to his admiration of Mr. Joseph Jefferson as an actor and a man may be accepted as a creditable motive for writing these Reminiscences, but not a sufficient justification for the printing of such a mass of slipshod, trivial, irrelevant, and egotistical detail. In one sense, indeed, this bulky volume may be pronounced entirely superfluous, for it sheds no ray of new light upon its subject, contains no fact of the slightest importance that was not long ago a matter of record, and substitutes for those more weighty qualities which alone can give value to anecdotal biography—such as discreet selection, explanatory comment, or illuminative comparison—a flow of continuous eulogy, always indiscriminate, and often silly. There are, doubtless, plenty of persons of the kind whose appetite for theatrical gossip is insatiable, who will read with avidity Mr. Wilson's rhapsodies over the most trifling action or utterance of the famous comedian, but many a stanch friend of Mr. Jefferson, as he closes the book, will be tempted to exclaim, with feelings akin to indignation, "An enemy hath done this." The old saying, "No man is a hero to his valet," will assume hereafter in their minds a new significance. Yet it would be the grossest injustice to suspect Mr. Wilson for a moment of the least malicious intent. The fervor of his adulation is manifestly sincere. An indifferent actor himself, the exquisite technical proficiency, delicate humor, and natural pathos of Jef-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ferson must have seemed to him almost miraculous. His appreciation of these artistic beauties has been shared by many millions of his grateful fellow-creatures. It is his misfortune, rather than his fault, that he is almost wholly deficient in the qualifications necessary for his purpose. Wise choice of material is as essential to the erection of a permanent monument as constructive skill.

The book is written with a certain amount of verbal fluency, but is chaotic in arrangement, and is stuffed at all points with the foolish chatter of the theatrical press agent. Mr. Wilson is among the most industrious of recent chroniclers of small beer. His intimacy with Mr. Jefferson was comparatively brief, and his recollections limited—good reason why these should not have been padded so egregiously, or repeated so often. If three-fourths of them had been omitted, the remainder would have been three times as valuable, as illustrations of the true Jefferson, who seems, indeed, to have had occasional misgivings as to the discretion of his enthusiastic Boswell. To give examples of the latter's many childish infelicities would occupy more space than can be spared for them. Moreover, further publicity is undesirable. It is better to refer briefly to such passages as are more worthy of Mr. Wilson's subject, and more pertinent to it. These discourse agreeably enough, but with no especial freshness of perception or expert knowledge, of Mr. Jefferson's art and personality; of his untiring industry and sure instinct in perfecting his ideals of Rip Van Winkle and the two or three other characters upon which his fame as an actor depends; of his devotion to painting and fishing; of his shrewdness as a connoisseur of pictures; of his genial and optimistic temperament and his universal popularity. But Mr. Wilson's persistent mood of ecstatic hero-worship adds no weight to his tribute, while wofully exposing his own frailty of judgment. He appears to think that "Rip Van Winkle" was a model of dramatic composition, instead of one of the feeblest, trickiest, and most immoral plays ever written, and is enthusiastic over the wholesale mutilation and unlimited "gagging" which marked the so-called all-star production of "The Rivals." As a full justification of Mr. Jefferson's career, he writes: "He was neither a reformer nor an educationalist. He did not, need not, concern himself with questions of æsthetic public import." This is one of the most pregnant sentences in the book. But did ever eulogy contain a sharper sting? Well might the sufferer exclaim, with old fat Jack, "A plague upon such friendship, say I."

As might be expected, some of Mr. Jefferson's quoted conversations are of more interest than Mr. Wilson's sentiments and opinions. He held that Macbeth was in the beginning a good man; differing on this point from Henry Irving. His argument was that Macbeth uttered some fine philosophical speeches, such as "Life's but a walking shadow," etc. Irving maintained that these were satirical, to which Jefferson replied that Macbeth spoke them when alone, and that a man was not likely to speak satirically to himself. Shakspere, he added, always made his characters reveal their true selves in their soliloquies. Irving said nothing then, but later on remarked that he could not understand how some American students of Macbeth could so misconceive his nature. At another time Jefferson, discussing oratory and acting, said: "The orator must be impressive, the actor impressionable. The orator must speak only; the actor must not only talk, but listen—and an actor who does not know how to listen has half his art to learn—and he must also show what he is feeling as he listens. The orator never has to listen. His art is therefore so much the easier." He forgot, apparently, that an orator must feel the temper of his audience, or risk failure, but there is a truth in his saying which is most imperfectly comprehended by many modern players.

Another acute remark of his was that acting was more a gift than an art. "The great value of art, when applied to the stage, is that it enables the performer to reproduce the gift, and so move his audience night after night, even though he has acted the same character a thousand times." He evidently understood the danger of acting on the impulse of the moment and thus unconsciously modifying the gesture, intonation, or expression, originally determined on as most appropriate to the fictitious character and situation. What most actors call inspiration is simply a surrender to their own private and personal impulses, which are often entirely foreign to the projected impersonation.

We conclude with a characteristic anecdote illustrative of the cheery spirit which lightened the old comedian's life to its close. Not long before his death, he was pointing out the lath supports which he had made for the tomato vines in his beloved garden. "The saddest thing in old age," he said, "is the absence of expectation. You no longer look forward to things. Now a garden is all expectation—and you often get a lot you don't expect. Therefore I have become a gardener. When you are past seventy, don't forget to cultivate a garden. It is all expectation." Herein is a reflection of the humanity and the humor which made the personality of Jefferson so fascinating both on and off the stage. There are few such nuggets in the book, and they can be found only by sifting a vast amount of rubbish.

Rise of the New West, 1819-1829. By Frederick J. Turner. [The American Nation, Vol. XIV.]. Harpers. 1906. Pp. xviii., 366.

Although Professor Turner's volume necessarily deals with a number of topics not directly connected with the rise of the West, its most distinctive contribution is in the field indicated by its title. The editor's choice of a collaborator is as happy as it was inevitable, for no one has studied the early history of the West, in certain aspects of it, more thoroughly, or written about it more instructively, than the accomplished professor of American history in the University of Wisconsin. To those who have been wont to attribute all of our important political happenings to either New England, Washington, or the South, it cannot but be both instructive and refreshing to find the significance of the central West, with its ideas and ideals, judicially and sympathetically appraised. To be sure, only the beginning of the newer Western development in the constitutional period falls to Professor Turner's share, and the exigencies of space have enforced obvious brevity; but what is presented is a welcome addition to the equipment of ordered knowledge in its field.

While the relation of the West to all the main events of the decade 1819-1829 is kept in view throughout the volume, the distinctive characteristics of the section as a whole are particularly dwelt upon in the four chapters entitled respectively "Colonization of the West," "Social and Economic Development of the West," "Western Commerce and Ideals," and "The Far West." The rapid growth of population in the region beyond the Alleghenies, the expanding agriculture and trade, and the steady conquest of new territory, became, after the War of 1812, factors of prime importance in national politics. On two of the main issues during the period, tariff and internal improvements, the demand of the West for recognition exercised a determining influence. The spirit and temper which lay back of and prompted this demand—a spirit little mindful of tradition and form, impatient of authority, ready to ride rough-shod over precedents and proprieties, and, withal, extremely self-conscious and self-contained—was little understood by the generation which saw the awakening of it; yet within scarcely more than a dozen years the West had developed a new democracy, and thenceforward pressed its claims upon the country until, with the election of Jackson, the people came into their own. It is this new Western spirit, little appreciated hitherto by historians, that Professor Turner analyzes with praiseworthy judgment and sympathy.

If any criticism is to be passed on the author's treatment of Western history, it is that strictly political matters are presented in scanty detail. On such topics as population and the settled area, roads and canals, trade and commerce, and the like, the outlines of the picture are tolerably complete. The political history of the States, on the other hand, whether separately or as a whole, is not much dwelt upon. We should like to know more about such matters as the development of State constitutions and governmental forms, especially local government; the legal modifications introduced in the process of borrowing from the older East and South; elections and office-holding, and State taxation and revenue. Doubtless, Professor Turner is right in making the development of Western democracy appear to depend chiefly on economic and national forces; but the outcome of this development in the field of State and local politics merits, we think, more attention than is here given to it.

For the rest, the volume discusses, as accompaniments of this democratic change, though not always an integral part of it, the principal events of the period: the financial crisis of 1819, the Missouri Compromise, the Monroe Doctrine, internal improvements, the tariffs of 1824 and 1828, and the tortuous course of party politics. Three early chapters on New England, the Middle States, and the South, are excellent examples of summary characterization; and the portrait of Adams is sympathetically drawn. For the first time in the volumes of this series relating to the Constitutional period, the subject of slavery holds a prominent place, the cross-play of economic and political influences being especially accent-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ed. The maps are numerous and good; those showing western Indian trading-posts and routes of travel, 1820-1835, and highways and waterways in the United States, 1826-1830, both in colors, being particularly notable. The bibliography lists much unfamiliar literature in addition to the better-known authorities.

Morocco of To-Day. By Eugène Aubin. E. P. Dutton. 1906.

What has become of our ancient friend Raisuli? Can any picture of the topsyturvydom of Morocco be complete without this Offenbachian brigand, who uses the telephone and fleeces his victims with bucket-shop adroitness—but *vi et armis*? In this age of associations for the preservation of ancient monuments, surely a society might be formed for maintaining Morocco in all its delightful incongruity. What could be more queer, more stimulating to the philosophic imagination, than the contrast of His Highness Muley Abdelaziz, Lord of the Believers, dabbling in motor launches, dirigible balloons, and polo, while all around him a political and social system tries to flourish very much as the Old Testament informs us that of the ancient Jews did in Palestine? The hodge-podge is complete. Not only do we have the confusion of races—Moors, Berbers, Jews, negroes, and Arabs—but these last may show us two adjacent tribes, one light-skinned, the other black. The four Arab tribes from the Sahara that dominate Morocco—the Makhzen—have only succeeded in erecting the flimsiest of political fabrics, in which traditions time-honored in Abraham's day still find a conspicuous place. Among them warfare has become as farcical as it was in Italy in the good old days of the Condottieri; and if trophies of victory are required to deck the Bab el-Marucq, at Fez, the heads not of the enemy but of the most handy persons are commandeered to serve the turn. The Sultan himself is the Ishmael among sovereigns. He has four capitals, and constantly wanders from one to the other, to say nothing of occasional excursions to cities of less importance.

But how picturesque, how remote, it all is! There, opposite our Carolinas, stretches a kingdom whose poets still sing their laments for the loss of Granada: "How deeply I mourn for the past that has fled. God! The days of joy and pleasure, the evenings calm and sweet! Homes of Andalusia that we have left behind us, how cruel the parting! Never shall I forget you."

M. Eugène Aubin is a French observer of Morocco, with the gift of precise, delicate, sympathetic appreciation. This he is able to convert into words, and the result is a very good book. It suffers from a certain unevenness, proceeding from the fact that the chapters were each originally contributions to reviews and journals; a little judicious compression and assimilation would have improved it. There are, however, some exceptionally good chapters, notably that on Bu Hamara, in which Moroccan warfare is described with a pleasing lightness of touch, and yet with a precision of detail that convinces the reader that here is the truth of the matter. The author describes many places, institutions, and customs, together with some of the internal incidents of the years 1902-3; but he does not deal with international questions save for a few trade statistics. The translation is fair, and contains few slips.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Armstrong, Sir Walter. Thomas Gainsborough. Dutton. 75 cents net.
Baedeker's Rhine, $2.10 net.—Great Britain, $3 net. Imported by Scribners.
Baker, Thomas O. The Action Primer. American Book Co.
Breasted, James Henry. Ancient Records of Egypt. Vols. II. and III. University of Chicago Press.
Campbell, Frances. The Measure of Life. Dutton. $1.50.
Carmichael, Montgomery. In Tuscany. Dutton. $2 net.
Chambers, Robert W. The Tracer of Lost Persons. Appleton. $1.50.
Danby, Frank. The Sphinx's Lawyer. F. A. Stokes Co. $1.50.
Day, Lewis F. Alphabets, Old and New. New ed. Imported by Scribners. $1.25 net.
Deeping, Warwick. Bess of the Woods. Harpers. $1.50.
DeMille, James. Cord and Creese. Harpers. $1.
Dole, Nathan Haskell. The Building of the Organ. Moffat, Yard & Co. $1.25 net.
Fischer, Louis. The Health-Care of the Baby. Funk & Wagnalls Co. 75 cents net.
Foster, Ardeen. Short Stories. McElroy Publishing Co.
Fox, Florence C. The Indian Primer. American Book Co.
Franklin, Frank George. The Legislative History of Naturalization in the United States. University of Chicago Press. $1.50 net.
Glimpses of the San Francisco Disaster. Chicago: Laird & Lee. 25 cents.
Goode, John. Recollections of a Lifetime. Neale Publishing Co. $2.
Hare, Christopher. A Queen of Queens and the Making of Spain. Scribners.
Herrmann, Wilhelm. The Communion of the Christian with God. Putnam. $1.50 net.
Hesseltine, Norman F. A Digest of the Law of Trade-Marks and Unfair Trade. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
Hewlett, Maurice, The Works of. Vol. IX: Pan and the Young Shepherd.—Vol. X.: Earthwork out of Tuscany. Macmillan Co.
Higgins, Hubert. Humaniculture. F. A. Stokes Co. $1.20 net.
Hight, George Ainslie. The Unity of Will. Dutton. $3 net.
Hill, Mabel. Lessons for Junior Citizens. Boston: Ginn & Co. 50 cents.
Hindlip, Lord. Sport and Travel: Abyssinia and British East Africa. A. Wessels Co. $6 net.
Hobson, R. L. *Porcelain of all Countries.* Dutton. $3.50 net.
House of Quiet, The. Dutton. $2 net.
Howard, John Hamilton. In the Shadow of the Pines. Eaton & Mains. $1.25.
Hubner, John Bessner. Consumption. Philadelphia: Lippincott.
Hutton, William Holden. The Church and the Barbarians. Macmillan Co. $1.
Hyatt, Thaddeus P. The Teeth and their Care. Brooklyn: King Press. 50 cents.
Johnson, Emory R. Ocean and Inland Water Transportation. Appleton. $1.50 net.
Jones, Harry C. The Electrical Nature of Matter and Radioactivity. D. Van Nostrand Co. $2.
Josephus, Flavius. The Works of. Translated by William Whiston. Edited by D. S. Margoliouth. Dutton.
Laurel Music-Reader. Edited by W. L. Tomlins. Boston: C. C. Birchard & Co.
Leacock, Stephen. Elements of Political Science. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.75 net.
Letters from a Surgeon in the Civil War. Compiled by Martha D. Perry. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
Lincoln, Abraham, Complete Works of. Edited by J. G. Nicolay and John Hay. Vols. V. and VI. Francis D. Tandy Co.
Lord, Walter Frewen. The Mirror of the Century. John Lane Co.
Macfall, Haldane. Sir Henry Irving. Boston: John W. Luce & Co.
Macphail, Andrew. The Vine of Sibmah. Macmillan Co. $1.50.
Mahaffy, John Pentland. The Silver Age of the Greek World. University of Chicago Press. $3 net.
Major, David R. First Steps in Mental Growth. Macmillan Co. $1.25.
Marchant, E. C. Greek Reader. Vol. II. Henry Frowde.
Maxey, Edwin. International Law. St. Louis: The F. H. Thomas Law Book Co.
McKay, William D. The Scottish School of Painting. Imported by Scribners. $2 net.
Mifflin, Lloyd. My Lody of Dream. Henry Frowde.
Park, Mungo. Travels in the Interior of Africa. Imported by Scribners. $1.25 net.
Pierce the Ploughmans Crede. Transcribed and edited by Walter W. Skeat. Henry Frowde.
Pope, G. U. A Handbook of the Ordinary Dialect of the Tamil Language. Henry Frowde.
Power, John O'Connor. The Making of an Orator. Putnams. $1.35 net.
Preissig, Edward. Notes on the History and Political Institutions of the Old World. Putnams. $2.50 net.
Propertius. Translated by J. S. Phillimore. Henry Frowde. 3s. 6d. net.
Reed, William. The Phantom of the Poles. Walter S. Rockey Co.
Robinson, E. Kay. The Religion of Nature. McClure, Phillips & Co. 90 cents net.
Sabatier, Paul. Séparation des Eglises et de l'Etat. Paris: Fischbacher.
Sichel, Edith. The Life and Letters of Alfred Ainger. Dutton. $3.50 net.
Sonnenschein, William Swan. Five Thousand Words Frequently Misspelt. Dutton. 50 cents.
Thompson, Holland. *From the Cotton Field to the Cotton Mill.* Macmillan Co. $1.50 net.
Todd, Charles Burr. In Olde Connecticut. The Grafton Press. $1.25 net.
Van Vorst, Marie. The Sin of George Warrener. Macmillan Co.
Warner, Anne. Susan Clegg and her Neighbors' Affairs. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. $1.
Wells, Amos R. Tuxedo Avenue to Water Street. Funk & Wagnalls Co. $1.

Vivid character studies of the Clintons, Hamilton, Burr, Van Buren, Seymour, Thurlow Weed, and others dominate "A POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK" (1774-1861), by D. S. Alexander, representing the Buffalo district in Congress. This book presents a history of the movements of political parties and traces the interesting causes and history of the prominent factional political divisions in New York politics. 2 vols. 8vo, $5.00 net, carriage extra.

HENRY HOLT & CO. NEW YORK

LIBRARY RESEARCH

Topics of all kinds and in any language looked up in the Boston and Harvard libraries, for scholars, writers, and others. Abstracts, copies, translations, and bibliographies made. Proof-reading and revision of manuscript. Highest university and library references.

MISS M. H. BUCKINGHAM,
96 Chestnut Street, Boston, Mass.

The Food Factor in Disease

Being an investigation into the Humoral Causation, Meaning Mechanism, and Rational Treatment, Preventive and Curative, of the Paroxysmal Neurosis (Migraine, Asthma, Angina Pectoris, Epilepsy, etc.), Bilious Attacks, Gout, Catarrhal and Other Affections, High Blood Pressure, Circulatory, Renal, and Other Degenerations.

By FRANCIS HARE, M.D., late Consulting Physician to the Brisbane General Hospital; Inspector-General of Hospitals for Queensland. 2 vols., medium 8vo, pp. I-xiv-497, II-viii-536. *Net* $10.00

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., New York

'Every page is absorbing.'—*Chicago Record-Herald*

THE EVASION

By EUGENIA BROOKS FROTHINGHAM

Author of "The Turn of the Road."

WHAT WE ARE DOING FOR LIBRARIANS.

We now have the most efficient department for the handling of Library orders.

1. A tremendous miscellaneous stock,
2. Greatly increased facilities for the importation of English publications.
3. Competent bookmen to price lists and collect books.

All of this means prompt and complete shipments and right prices.

THE BAKER & TAYLOR CO.,
WHOLESALE BOOKSELLERS,
33-37 East Seventeenth St., New York.

CAROLINA LEE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED